3935. aaa 15

# AN APOLOGY FOR THE CATHOLICS OF GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND.

Great Britain & Ireland. — Roman Catholics

K

# APOLOGY

FOR THE

# CATHOLICS

OF

# GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

AN

# APOLOGY

FOR THE

# CATHOLICS

OF

GTEAT BTITAIN and IRELAND:

Humbly offered to the Conſideration of the

KING's moſt Excellent Majeſty

AND

Both Houſes of PARLIAMENT.

---

*Try the Spirits, whether they are of God.*
1 Epiſt. Gen. John. iv. 1.

---

LONDON: Printed.

DUBLIN: Re-printed in the Year

MDCCLXVIII.

# THE PREFACE.

# THE PREFACE.

OF late the Catholics have been ſo aſperſed and vilified, that perſons, unacquainted with their principles, might, with good reaſon, ſuſpect that ſomething is repugnant in them to all divine and human laws, and conſequently that the Catholics, the abettors of them, deſerve the moſt rigorous puniſhments, or ſhould be totally ſuppreſſed and excluded ſociety. Thoſe who have undertaken thus to traduce them, have, no doubt, their motives for ſo doing; but if theſe motives were examined by the teſt of a candid diſquiſition, it is greatly to be feared they would appear exceeding frivolous: in ſome, they would be found influenced by a much larger portion of blind zeal than true knowledge;

ledge; in others, by vain terrors and apprehenſions; in others, by a ſpirit of malevolence, or view of indulging the humour of calumniating; and in others, by the perhaps iniquitous deſign of diſturbing the peace of his Majeſty's government. It may be much queſtioned, whether better grounded motives can be aſſigned; and, if not, this juſt inference may be drawn, that there is nothing of ſo pernicious a tendency in the faith of Catholics, nor any thing ſo baſe or corrupt in their morals, as to make them objects of public deteſtation; and if they are conſidered in a political light, their number is not ſo conſiderable, nor their intereſt ſo powerful, as to create any jealouſy in the ſtate. They have long enjoyed the lenity of the government, and are thankful for it; and as their intention is no other than to demean themſelves as good ſubjects, they hope for a continuance of the ſame benevolent diſpoſition.

However,

However, as there are certain reaſons for ſuppoſing them obnoxious to the preſent eſtabliſhment in Church and State; and as there are, and may be always, reſtleſs men to ſtir up perſecution againſt them, and this chiefly for the ſake of ſerving ſome private end, or through a miſtaken zeal; it ſeems highly neceſſary, as matters are now circumſtanced, to ſtate the caſe of the Catholics in the Britiſh Dominions: And, the Author of the following ſheets has endeavoured to do it in ſo fair and impartial a manner, with ſo much ſincerity and truth, and without the leaſt diſguiſe, that he flatters himſelf, every diſpaſſionate Proteſtant, thinking ſeriouſly, and judging upon mature reflection, will enentertain more favourable ſentiments of the Catholics, and will have a heart averſe from the treatment they have hitherto experienced. The Author alſo declares, that he is far from intending the leaſt offence againſt the Govern-

Government, or any religious claſs of men, tolerated by the Law; and being ſenſible that animoſity can be attended with few prevailing arguments in diſceptations of this kind, he quite diſclaims it: for he aims at nothing more than a modeſt Apology for the Religion he profeſſes.

*Note.* All the Texts of Scripture hereafter quoted, are from the Proteſtant Tranſlation of the Bible.

AN

# AN APOLOGY, &c.

## CHAP. I.

### *Of* PERSECUTION *in General.*

*These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended. They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doeth God service. And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the father nor me. But these things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said unto you at the beginning, because I was with you.*

John xvi. 1, 2, 3, 4.

THESE are the words of Christ comforting his Apostles under all future Persecutions, and they seem to be particularly characteristic of the treatment they

were likely to receive from the Jews; who, regardleſs of Chriſt's doctrine and miracles, which fully proved him to be their expected Meſſiah, were notwithſtanding ſo enamoured of their carnal and ceremonial law, and ſo elated with the confidence they placed in it, as the only acceptable worſhip to God, that, fired with the moſt indignant emotions of blind zeal, they were always ready to perſecute thoſe who reminded them of their infatuation. It was not ſo with ſuch among the Jews, who were actuated with the ſpirit of the law: they interpreted all its ſacrifices, oblations, and ceremonies, as ſymbols of a more perfect law, the law of Redemption and Grace; for, as they were ſenſible from the predictions of their prophets, that God would "ſend his Son in "the fullneſs of time," ſo they were diſpoſed to receive and acknowledge him when he came. Simeon "waited for the conſolation of Iſrael, "and departed in peace when he had ſeen ſal-"vation." *We know thou art a teacher come from God*, ſaid Nicodemus to Chriſt, *for no man can do theſe miracles that thou doeſt, except God be with him*, John iii. 2. Thus Chriſt was under no apprehenſions of ill uſage to his beloved diſciples from thoſe Jews, whoſe hearts,

hearts replete with Charity, hoped, through the Meſſiah, for a perfect reconciliation with God; ſo that, when they heard the word, "they hardened not their hearts," but receiv-ed it with gladneſs, and ſtedfaſtly abided by its inſpirations. His concern, therefore, point-ed out the carnal Jews: Theſe vainly imagined that the Meſſiah was to appear among them in the ſplendor and majeſty of a mighty tem-poral prince, and that he was to go before them to fight their battles, and reſcue them from the dominion of the Romans: they could not conceive that his kingdom was not of this world; and ſeeing him appear in an humble ſtate, defenceleſs, unprotected, and without any authority or power, than what the im-portance of his miſſion and doctrine command-ed, they rejected him with contempt, put him to an ignominious death, and raiſed dreadful Perſecutions againſt all his followers.

Paſſion and prejudice retain a very powerful aſcendant over the minds of men; it is cool reflection and ſound judgment, aided by the moſt cogent reaſons, that muſt diſſipate the clouds they raiſe. Nothing in Chriſt's ap-pearance, as we have ſeen, could perſuade the

carnal Jews that he was the promiſed and prefigured expectation of nations; that as he was the end of the law, ſo it was fulfilled in him; and that conſequently his doctrine was to ſuperſede it. Theſe were novel notions to them, and ſtrongly marked, as they ſuppoſed, with a deſign to impoſe upon their intellects. Hence, we need not wonder, if in putting Chriſt's diſciples out of their ſynagogues, and even killing them, they thought they did God ſervice. It was, as they were fully perſuaded, incumbent on them to oppoſe all innovations; and it muſt be allowed, under ſuch a deception from appearances, that there was ſome ſhadow of reaſon to plead for their exerting themſelves in the way they did. This, therefore, is all that can be ſaid to extenuate the crime of Perſecution in the carnal Jews; for, as no interior conviction wrought ſo prevalently, as to make them judge that their law ought to be abrogated, we cannot be much ſurprized to find them ſo tenacious of every thing belonging to it, and ſo vigilant in guarding againſt whatever might be hurtful to its preſervation.

Perſecution, raiſed upon ſuch motives, and influenced by the notion of doing God ſervice, may

may be ſtyled *Religious Perſecution*, in contradiſtinction to another ſort, which I call *Political Perſecution*.

The firſt ſort of Perſecution, whatever allowances the Moſaic law may indulge the Jews in, is, in the main, incompatible with Chriſtian perfection. The evangelical precept is expreſs againſt treating any one as our enemy. *Ye have heard that it hath been ſaid, Thou ſhalt, love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy: but I ſay unto you, Love your enemies, bleſs them that curſe you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which deſpightfully uſe you and perſecute you*, Matt. v. 43, 44. If then the Goſpel inculcates, that we ſhould conſider all mankind as our neighbours; that a friendly diſpoſition ſhould manifeſt itſelf in the whole conduct of our life; that fraternal charity ſhould be, as it were, the moving force of our actions; and that univerſal benevolence ſhould conſtantly inſpire our hearts with the warmeſt affection for the welfare of our fellow-creatures; there will be no room left for imagining, that to chaſten with the rod of Perſecution, is doing God ſervice, much leſs that it can be juſtified in his ſight. Some may inſinuate, that Chriſt

came not to ſend peace on the earth, but the "ſword", and that he recommended, from the words, "compel them to come in", conſtraint. In the firſt place, Chriſt may have meant no more than the many tribulations we muſt ſuffer before we are found worthy to enter into his kingdom; that our life on earth is a ſtate of warfare; and that notwithſtanding the grace he gives us, when we ſincerely aſk it, for our ſanctification, we are to be engaged in conflicts with our paſſions, which for our probation he has not thought proper to exempt us from. In the ſecond place, it is impoſſible for a man to be a good or orthodox Chriſtian from mere compulſion. You muſt correct his heart, or convince his underſtanding. Tortures may extort a confeſſion from his lips, but how is his mind diſpoſed? Has he that has undertaken to reclaim him from error, or to make him return to the ways of righteouſneſs, prayed that the divine illumination might reſt upon his ſoul? Has he behaved as St. Paul counſels Timothy: *Preach the word, be inſtant in ſeaſon, out of ſeaſon; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long ſuffering and doctrine?* Tim. iv. 2. In ſhort, no ſacrifice is agreeable to God, but that which is perfectly voluntary; and, if we

ſerve

ſerve him truly and unfeignedly, we muſt ſerve him with a love of choice and a love of reaſon. We ought therefore endeavour to recall our brother that has ſtrayed from the ſheepfold, not with reviling menaces, but with gentle perſuaſion: we ſhould mildly expoſtulate with him on the caprice, the ſelf-love, the pride, that have diverted him to a wrong bias: if we perceive any other ſource of his deluſion, we are to point it out ſo as to make him ſenſible of it. Above all, the danger of the future health of his ſoul, by denying or perverting any truth the authority of the unerring God has revealed, is too intereſting a topic not to be particularly attended to: add to this, the ſcandal he has given his neighbour, or the guilt he has involved him in by infecting him with the poiſon of his opinions. All theſe conſiderations, duly weighed, may be productive of the moſt ſalutary effects; ſo that the wound that could not bear the pungency of ſharp medicine, promiſes a compleat cure by the benign qualities of lenient balſam.

*Political Perſecution* ſeems to have in view, not ſo much the intention of doing God ſervice, as being of ſervice to the ſtate. Every

government has adopted a favourite ſyſtem of religion, and wiſhes that all its members would indiſcriminately conform to it, in order to promote the purpoſes of unanimity, a thing very deſirable in a well policed ſtate. Hence the civil power friendly conſpires with thoſe to whom they have delegated the eccleſiaſtical power, to cheriſh and maintain in permanency this favourite religious ſyſtem. The latter are to take care that no attempt is formed which has a tendency to its abolition, either by the introduction of a new one, or by altering any material point with ſtrange gloſſes and interpretations. The former, upon a report made of the delinquent's offence, with the circumſtances aggravating or extenuating it, proceed to inflict on him ſuch pains and penalties, as the laws have in ſuch caſe provided.

Theſe preliminary and general notions may be conſidered, as ſo many definitions and poſtulatums, which will be of ſervice in the ſubſequent diſcuſſions and animadverſions on Perſecution in Particular, as it has been occaſionally adopted by Catholics and Proteſtants. We ſhall therefore examine the mutual recriminations of both on this head.

CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of the Charge of* PERSECUTION *brought againſt Catholics by Proteſtants.*

THE Proteſtants accuſe the Catholics of having recourſe to Perſecution in a variety of ways, which may be reduced to three capital points, viz. *actual Puniſhment*, *Intolerance*, and *Uncharitableneſs*.

In the primitive ages of the Church, it was cuſtomary with thoſe who were placed in any degree of authority in the Church, to ſignify their diſpleaſure of any immoral practice, or any doctrine contrary to the faith received, by *exhortation*, *commination*, or *excommunication*. The parties were firſt admoniſhed by words of gentle perſuaſion, to relinquiſh that vicious courſe of life which had given ſo much ſcandal to the Faithful: or if they had publiſhed any erroneous opinions, they were earneſtly entreated to retract them, that ſo the further ſpreading of the contagion might be timely prevented, and the unity of faith preſerved. If they perſiſted, they were threatened with

God's judgments, which were ſuppoſed to await them even in this world, by ſome diſmal calamity in their perſons or fortune. If they remained deaf to all counſels, ſollicitations, and threats; ſelf-willed, obſtinate, inflexible, and incorrigible; they were cut off from the communion of the Faithful, and by that act adjudged to heap coals of fire on their own heads, to draw down on them the fierce wrath of God, and, by final impenitence, that eternal enmity between God and the ſinner, which muſt be attended with eternal puniſhment; for, though God is long-ſuffering, and his mercy knows no bounds, yet, on the prevaricator of his law, and on him who ſays I will not ſerve, his juſtice will be exerted in the moſt ſignal manner.

We find examples of the methods of proceeding againſt heretics and ſcandalous ſinners, ſet by the Apoſtles themſelves to their ſucceſſors in the Church. Scarce was the door of faith opened unto the Gentiles, when certain men who came down from Judea, and certain of the ſect of Phariſees who believed, had endeavoured to ſubvert their ſouls by perſuading them, that they could not be ſaved unleſs

leſs they were circumciſed, and kept the law of Moſes, *Acts* xv. This doctrine, which was far from being countenanced by the Apoſtles, who had given no commandment about it, was condemned in the firſt general council held at Jeruſalem. And as to ſcandalous ſinners, we ſee a form of excommunication recommended by St. Paul againſt the inceſtuous Corinthian: *In the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, when ye are gathered together, and my ſpirit, with the power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to deliver ſuch a one unto Satan for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that the ſpirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord Jeſus*, 1 Cor. 4, 5.

Whilſt the ſword of juſtice remained in the hands of the Pagans, it was not poſſible for the Church to puniſh otherwiſe any of her inteſteſtine enemies, than by denouncing anathemas againſt them; neither, when peace was reſtored to her, by the converſion of Conſtantine the Great, did ſhe adopt any weapons offenſive or defenſive, but ſuch as were purely ſpiritual. Not long after the reign of Conſtantine, the Arian hereſy gained ground, particularly in the eaſtern diviſion of the Roman empire, from the countenance ſhewn it by the

emperor

emperor Conſtantius, there aroſe ſharp conteſts between the Orthodox and Arians. Theſe conteſts, however, on the ſide of the true profeſſors of chriſtianity, did not exceed the bounds of friendly expoſtulations in ſupport of the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: for, indeed, they were the perſecuted, and not the perſecuting party; the arm of the ſecular power was uplifted againſt them, and as St. Jerom expreſſes it, "The whole world was aſtoniſhed at its having become Arian."*

If, therefore, it is ſuppoſed the Catholic Church had at any time promoted, abetted, and aided Perſecution, and this by the corporal pains of impriſonment or death, by pecuniary mulcts or forfeiture of eſtate, it muſt have been after the Roman empire had been diſmembered, and parcelled out into a multiplicity of ſtates and kingdoms, by the invaſions of the Goths, Vandals, and other barbarous nations; or rather after the weſtern empire had been, for the moſt part, re-united under Charlemagne: but upon the moſt diligent enquiry into eccleſiaſtical and civil hiſtory, it can-

* Totus mundus miratus eſt ſe Arianum factum.

cannot be found that the Catholick Church ever uſed compulſion in the converſion of infidels and heretics, without previouſly convincing the underſtanding and correcting the heart: neither can it be aſſerted and maintained, with any foundation of truth, that ſhe of herſelf, in virtue of any particular doctrine or interpretation of ſcripture, ever authoriſed Perſecution to the loſs of life or fortune on the account of hereſy. She never has been deciſive in this reſpect, but in conformity to ſcripture and the apoſtolical conſtitutions. When heretics have called in queſtion the doctrines tranſmitted to her care by Chriſt and his apoſtles, ſhe, in order to preſerve inviolate that ſacred depoſitum of Faith, has convened general or national councils, as beſt ſuited the occaſion, and by their united ſuffrages, after a fair hearing and canvaſſing the matters in debate, has condemned them as repugnant to the word of God, and perhaps deſtructive of Chriſtian morality. In this truly legal manner, and conſonant to the preſcript of the apoſtles, have been condemned all the hereſies that ever ſprouted up in the Church: and who will ſay that this is Perſecution, or a reſtraint laid upon the intellects of men? No,

if

if we believe Chriſt and his apoſtles, it is not. St. Paul will have us captivate our intellects into the obedience of faith, as faith is the evidence of things that do not appear: ſo that, the whole charge of favouring Perſecution in the Catholic Church will amount only to this, that the ſecular powers, members of that Church, do impriſon, put to death, or otherwiſe maltreat, and ſubject to pains and penalties, ſuch heretics, who perſiſt, notwithſtanding their condemnation by the eccleſiaſtical powers, in teaching and publiſhing their erroneous opinions, contrary to the peace and laws of the ſtate. All this is very true: the police of every ſtate in Europe, and in other parts of the world, where the Catholic religion is, or has been eſtabliſhed, requires, in a great degree, this Perſecution, for its tranquillity, ſafety, and permanency. But this perſecution is nothing more than that Political one, defined in the latter part of the foregoing chapter, therefore it cannot be ſaid to proceed immediately from the Catholic Church, as taught, inculcated, or dictated by her; becauſe, indeed, the ſpirit of the Catholic Church in this point, is no other than has been alſo defined and illuſtrated

luſtrated under the denomination of *Religious Perſecution*, in the ſame chapter.

I am well aware here of the objections that may be ſtarted, and ſeem to bear hard on Catholicks, as if there was ſomething in their principles that really tended to encourage the perſecuting of all thoſe who entertained opinions contrary to any of the tenets of their Church. For, if nothing of the kind can be imputed to their principles, and if their Church breaths nothing ſo much as lenity and compaſſion, with a ſincere deſire for the converſion of all ſinners and thoſe who have been ſeduced by error; how, with all theſe truly evangelical ſentiments, ſhould pope Innocent III. lay the firſt foundation of the Inquiſition, a tribunal ſtill ſubſiſting, and erected in Spain, Portugal, and Italy, by his authority, to take cognizance of hereſy, judaiſm, mahommedaniſm, ſodomy, and polygamy? How could Catholicks be guilty of the horrid maſſacres that were perpetrated on the Proteſtants in France and Ireland? And how could they contrive the Powder-plot, and ſeveral others, to the deſtruction of the Proteſtants in England? Theſe objections are of moment, and deſerve to be cleared

cleared up: and, as firſt, the Inquiſition was calculated for the ſuppreſſion of the Albigenſes, it will not be amiſs to give here a ſhort hiſtory of them.

The Albigenſes were a general ſect, compoſed of ſeveral heretics, who made their appearance in the twelfth century, and whoſe principal deſign was to overthrow the hierarchical order, to trouble the diſcipline of the Church, and to diſſuade Chriſtians from receiving the ſacramenit. They were ſo called, becauſe Oliver, one of the diſciples of Peter de Valdo, chief of the Vaudois or poor of Lyons, was the firſt that publiſhed their errors in Albi a town of the Upper Languedoc, on the Tarn, and this town was, as it were, the center of the provinces which they infected with their opinions.

This hereſy, which revived Manicheiſm, Arianiſm, and the other dogmas of the antient ſectaries, to which it added a diverſity of errors peculiar to the different branches of the ſect, had its firſt riſe in Bulgaria. The Cathari, or Puritans, were the ſource from which it ſprung; and the Paulicians of Armenia having

ing

ing conveyed it into Germany, Italy, and Provence, Peter de Bruys and Henry brought it, 'tis ſaid, into Languedoc, and Arnaldus of Breſcia fomented it, which occaſioned the giving to thoſe hereticks the name of Henricians, Petrobuſians, Arnaldiſts, Puritans, Piffers, Patarins, Weavers, Good-Men, Publicans, Paſſagians, &c. and to all of them afterwards the general name of Albigenſes.

Theſe were properly Manicheans. The errors they ſtand accuſed of by Alanus, a monk of Citeaux, and Peter, a monk of Vaux-Cermay, the co-temporary authors that wrote againſt them, are, firſt, admitting two principles or two creatures, the one good, the other evil. The firſt, the creator of inviſible and ſpiritual things; the ſecond, the creator of the body, and author of the Old Teſtament, which they rejected, admitting the New, and yet rejecting the utility of the ſacraments. Secondly, admitting two Chriſts: one wicked, who had appeared on earth with a fantaſtic body, as the Marcionites had pretended, and who had lived and roſe from the dead only in appearance; the other good, but who had not been ſeen in the world. Thirdly, denying the reſurrection

tion of the fleſh, and believing that our ſouls are either demons, or other ſouls lodged in our bodies in puniſhment of the crimes of their paſt life; conſequently denying purgatory, the neceſſity of prayers for the dead, and treating as fabulous the belief of the Catholics concerning hell. Fourthly, condemning all the ſacraments of the Church; rejecting baptiſm as uſeleſs; abhorring the Euchariſt; practiſing neither Confeſſion nor Penance; and believing Marriage forbidden: to which may be added their hatred againſt the Miniſters of the Church, and their contempt of images and relics. They were generally divided into two orders, the Perfect and the Believers. The Perfect led an auſtere and regular life, declaring an utter averſion againſt lies and ſwearing. The Believers, living as other men, and often in a very diſorderly manner, imagined themſelves ſaved by faith, and by the impoſition only of the hands of the Perfect.

This hereſy made in a ſhort time ſo great a progreſs in the ſouthern provinces of France, that in the 1176 it was condemned in a council held at Lombez, and in the general council of Lateran in 1179. But notwithſtanding the zeal

zeal of St. Dominic, and the other inquiſitors, theſe heretics multiplied greatly, and deſpiſed the anathemas of the Church. The temporal power at length joined the ſpiritual to exterminate them. A cruſade was promulgated and entered into againſt them in 1210, and it was not till after eighteen years of a bloody war, that, abandoned by the Counts of Toulouſe their protectors, and weakened by the victories of Simon de Montfort, the Albigenſes, proſecuted in the eccleſiaſtical tribunals, and delivered over to the ſecular power, were intirely deſtroyed, except ſome who joined the Vaudois in the vallies of Piedmont, France and Savoy. When the New Reformed appeared, thoſe heretics projected a Union with the Zuinghians, and at laſt joined the Calviniſts in the reign of Francis I. The execution of Cabrieres and Merindol, completed the diſſipating of the remains of this ſect, of which now nothing is known but the name. But though the Albigenſes joined the Vaudois, it muſt not be believed that the latter adopted their opinions; the Vaudois were never Manicheans, as M. Boſſuet has ſhewn in his *Hiſtory of the Variations*, book xi. *Petrus Vall. Cern. Sanderus, Baronius, Spondan de Marca, Boſſuet,*

*Boſſuet. Hiſt. des Variat. Dupin, Biblioth. eccleſ. Siecl.* XII. & XIII. Encyclopedie.

There are few or no Proteſtants of our days but would renounce all affinity with ſuch peſts of ſociety, and would acknowledge that the inſtitution of the Inquiſition againſt them was a neceſſary and juſtifiable meaſure. The Inquiſition was adopted in Spain and Portugal, as a check upon the Moors and Jews, who, for ſome temporal advantages, had embraced Chriſtianity; but if theſe happened to be withdrawn, they returned to their old religion, or privately practiſed it, ſtill enjoying their temporal benefits. Mere apoſtacy could not be the cauſe of its eſtabliſhment in Italy. It was there probably held forth only *interrorem*; and indeed the manner of its proceſs has been generally mild, and rarely exerciſed in that country. It is ſaid, that no perſon can be an informer, or give evidence in the inquiſition, whoſe immediate progenitors have been noted on account of any infamy for four generations. But it is generally averred by the Proteſtants, that the judges of this court take cognizance of crimes on common report, without any legal evidence, except what they themſelves procure.

cure. Be the matter as it may, the Inquiſition and the abuſes committed in it have been diſclaimed by the generality of Catholics: there are ſeveral Catholic countries where it was never received, and where it is, the Princes long ſince jealous of the power delegated by it to eccleſiaſtics, would be glad to have it aboliſhed; for, in fact, the true proceſs of the Catholic Church in ſimply condemning, not the perſons, but the doctrines of heretics, is fully ſufficient, as the ſecular arm can do itſelf juſtice, whenever the leaſt apprehenſions occur of diſturbance to the internal peace of the ſtate.

The maſſacres in France and Ireland were truly horrid, quite repugnant to the Goſpel of Chriſt, and no Catholic can or will juſtify them. Here we can only lament the depravity of human nature, and not any vice inherent to the Catholic Religion. On one ſide, we may paſs in review a King and a Queen Mother, ſo much the more jealous of their authority, as they had great reaſon to ſuſpect it was likely to be wreſted out of thein hands by a turbulent faction, which no reaſonable terms of pacification ſeemed properly to ſatisfy. On the

the other ſide, we behold the Iriſh prompted to revenge by a courſe of unrelenting ill treatment. Motives for the preſervation of a Religion excluſive of all others, were not therefore in the leaſt inſtrumental towards bringing about a cataſtrophe ſo fatal to a number of Proteſtants in France and Ireland. We naturally deteſt treachery, and all the ſtratagems that are artfully contrived to ſecure its ſucceſs; yet we cannot but blame thoſe who by their miſconduct have given occaſion to the conſpiracies formed againſt them. Where, from collating paſt circumſtances of inſurrection and rebellion, an intention ſeems ſtill manifeſt of dethroning a King, or reducing his power; ſurely he will, if he cannot by open force, cruſh his inveterate enemies in the moſt convenient manner he poſſibly can. The hiſtories of all countries furniſh us with examples in this reſpect.

This was the caſe with Catherine de Medicis and Charles IX. of France. Religion was out of the queſtion, though their zeal for it was pleaded as a ſpecious pretext by ſome, and perhaps by themſelves, for palliating a crime ſo ſhocking to humanity. It was anxiety for retain-

retaining a power which the Calviniſts had already ſapped the foundation of, that ſtruck the blow. It would argue, no doubt, more the true Chriſtian in a Prince to forfeit his crown, than to preſerve it on ſuch baſe terms: but how many Princes can be produced in whom the evangelical precept has precluded temporal intereſt? Very few inſtances indeed of the kind are to be met with. And if the love of the world prevails in moſt Princes, it may be ſuppoſed to prevail likewiſe more or leſs amongſt the inferior claſſes of mankind, not by a ſort of contagion ſpreading from Princes, but by a natural propenſity to maintain and cheriſh the good things of this life, and in ſome even preferably to the good things of the other life, when, in conſequence of an unhappy deluſion, they are conſidered by them in the light of vague and abſtracted notions.

According to ſuch merely natural, and not ſpiritual diſpoſitions, the temper of the Iriſh may be accounted for, when they came to a reſolution of ridding themſelves of the tyranny of the Engliſh and Scotch Proteſtants. Theſe troubleſome inmates, far from preaching up to them a purer light of the Goſpel than

than that which they had already through a ſucceſſion of many ages enjoyed, ſeemed ſolely intent on curtailing them of their lands and fortunes, and even entirely diſpoſſeſſing them on the moſt frivolous pretences. One might think that Ireland, in theſe times, was not a ſiſter country, though under the denomination of conquered, but ſome newly diſcovered region, like America, fit only to be conſigned over to the plunder of a bold invader. Harraſſed therefore, and circumvented in a cruel manner as they were, their properties turned out ſo precarious a tenure, that dire neceſſity became the engine that ſet them to work. A favourable opportunity contributed alſo to facilitate their deſigns. England at this time was in confuſion, by reaſon of the diſagreement between the King and his Parliament; ſo that, when the reins of government are once relaxed, bad men, with a proſpect of impunity, will be apt to undertake the worſt things. There were beſides many Proteſtants, both open and occult abettors of this bloody conſpiracy of the Iriſh; and theſe were ſuch with whom the odium of the Earl of Strafforde's deſpotic government was ſtill recent. Revenge operated

operated from different cauſes, for the effects ſtill ſubſiſted.

The plots called Popiſh in England, were never properly aſcertained. The powder-plot, ſtill commemorated by a form of prayer, in the Church of England, is ſuppoſed to be hatched by ſome of King James I.'s miniſters, whoſe heads, ſtill fecundated with the many devices of the kind Queen Elizabeth's reign was ſo prolific in, could not help giving it birth. Cecil, Earl of Saliſbury, is ſaid to be the chief contriver of it, to diſcredit the intereſt of the Catholics with King James. There was, however, ſomewhat of a plot, and a-kin to that, or an improvement upon the ſcheme, for which at laſt Sir Walter Raleigh unjuſtly ſuffered. Some Catholics were engaged in it; among others, Sir Everard Digby, a man of great fortune and eminent abilities. It was to ſeize upon the Lady Elizabeth, and proclaim her Queen. Sir Everard perſiſted ſteadily to maintain his innocence as to the Powder-treaſon; and whatever the nature of his crime was againſt the ſtate, he declared his being cenſured for it by the Prieſts and others of his Religion. Few are ignorant of Tonge's or Oates's plot;

and though Rapin is ſtrenuous to prove its identity on the Catholics, all ſober Proteſtants at this time are quite aſhamed of it. However, a great many Catholics, and ſome of illuſtrious birth, were innocently put to death on this occaſion, and otherwiſe ſuffered by fines, impriſonments, and a variety of ill uſage.

The next point in the charge againſt Catholics is *Intolerance*, which is anſwered by what has been ſaid in the firſt chapter concering Political Perſecution; ſo that we may proceed to the third part of the charge, which is *Uncharitableneſs*.

Proteſtants think it very heinous that Catholics ſhould ſay, there is no ſaving faith but their own, and that all out of the pale of their Church are damned. This they call a ſpiritual Perſecution, as haunting and tormenting the ſoul with diſmal terrors and apprehenſions. 'Tis true, Catholics ſay that their is no ſaving faith but their own; but they are far from confidently ſaying, that all out of the pale of their Church are damned. They have ſubſtantial reaſons for believing that their Church is the only which has preſerved the faith delivered by Chriſt

Chriſt to his apoſtles, and by the apoſtles to their ſucceſſors, intire and inviolated. If ſo, theirs is the ſaving faith: and if "without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God;" of conſequence, thoſe that are deſtitute of faith are not in the way of ſalvation. There is nothing uncharitable in this belief; it is rather charity to warn a perſon of his danger. But, ſays the Proteſtant, why do you confine the mercies of God? your judgment is raſh, and therefore uncharitable. I do not confine the mercies of God, replies the Catholic; neither is my judgment raſh. In the firſt place, the ever-gracious Author of Nature will undoubtedly have mercy on all thoſe whoſe conceptions have been fettered under invincible ignorance, provided they obſerve that law of Nature written upon their hearts, "do as you would be done by;" but from thoſe who have received lights and talents he will require an exact account of the uſes they have put them to. Here alſo, where there may be an internal repoſe of conſcience, and a perfect acquieſcence of mind, which border upon an invincible ignorance of a truer ſyſtem of faith, God will only look to the probity of the heart, and not the miſguided underſtanding. Now, as the judgment

of Catholics cannot be accounted raſh in reſtricting the mercies of God; ſo, in the ſecond place, it will not appear uncharitable; for charity may be well conſidered as an act of the will, and as an act of the judgment. As an act of the will, no Church has exhibited more illuſtrious ſpecimens of charity than the Catholic in willing the converſion of all ſinners, Jews, Mohammedans, Pagans, Heretics and Schiſmatics; and in not barely willing, but ardently praying and endeavouring for the ſame. Where are paſtors more indefatigable in inſtructing their reſpective flocks, than among the Catholics? Who bear the weight and heat of the day more than they? Who are more zealous in diſplaying the beauties of holineſs? Who are more upright in their lives and converſation? Who have taken more painful journies, or endured greater hardſhips, as miſſionaries, to convert infidels at the hazard of their lives? All theſe particulars argue in the higheſt degree, the charitable ſpirit of the Catholic Church, as to charity proceeding from the will: And ſo far as it may be an act of judgment, it cannot be conſtrued amiſs when Catholics judge from the promiſes of Chriſt to his Church, that thoſe who are not of that

Church

Church are in danger of riſquing their ſalvation; for, if there was a want of charity in ſo judging, St. Paul, by the ſame reaſon, might be deemed uncharitable for judging, that *neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abuſers of themſelves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor extortioners, ſhall inherit the kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Still the Proteſtant is diſpleaſed at this ſentence pronounced by the Catholic Church, and fancies to mollify it, that the aſſertion muſt be merely political in order to retain Catholics in their own Communion, or gain over proſelytes; but, indeed, it is quite the reverſe, being built upon ſuch irrefragable concluſions, drawn from the ſcripture doctrine, that it cannot be conteſted. I well know, that many gentlemen of the Church of England cannot bear the uſe of the Athanaſian Creed in their Liturgy, and wonder that their clergy are not ſo complaiſant as to expunge it, becauſe it makes holding to the Catholic faith the ground-work of ſalvation, and on this condition denounces everlaſting perdition againſt thoſe that do not. This, in their opinion, is a hard ſaying, yet is not leſs true; and at ſuch St. Paul ſeems to look with a pro-

phetic ſpirit, where he apprizes Timothy, *The time will come when they ſhall not endure ſound doctrine; but after their own luſts ſhall they heap to themſelves teachers, having itching ears.* 2. Tim. iv. 3.

There is another charge brought againſt Catholics, "of not keeping faith with heretics," which, as in ſome meaſure it ſeems collateral with Perſecution, deſerves to be here mentioned. Nothing is ſo unjuſt as this charge; it is quite falſe, and utterly diſclaimed by all Catholics. There may be unjuſt men among them; liars, breakers of their word, promiſe, or covenant; guilty of fraud and deceit; but their religion does not teach them to be ſo: it rather laments that it entertains ſuch rotten members in its boſom, ſtriving to reclaim, and to bring them back into the paths of righteouſneſs and the ſtrictneſs of the goſpel morality, by earneſtly recommending to them the moſt conſummate integrity in all their dealings with all mankind, whom as creatures of their common God and Father, "who maketh his ſun to riſe on the juſt and on the unjuſt," they are to live in charity with, and conſider as their neighbours, friends, and brethren.

CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

*Of the charge of* PERSECUTION *brought againſt Proteſtants by Catholics; with which are conſidered the Cauſes that gave room to the Reformation; the Proceedings of the firſt Reformers; and a Conference of Cardinal du Perron with Beza on Schiſm.*

HISTORY is the only evidence we can have recourſe to in this diſcuſſion, and it may be ſaid to afford a moral certainty, which in practice is as true as any other. Upon the faith of hiſtory ſuch men exiſted as Alexander the Great and Julius Cæſar; and belief, founded on ſuch teſtimony, is as true as two and two make four. If we examine, by the teſt of hiſtory, into the grounds the firſt Reformers had of ſeparating from the Catholic Church, we ſhall generally find it the reſult of ſome diſguſt, caprice, or baſe paſſion, and not the deſire of ſeeking the glory of God, and the purity of a worſhip worthy of him. I readily grant that the Church at that time, and perhaps long before that time, wanted a Refor-

mation, but it was a Reformation of Manners, and not of Faith. Many of the clergy lived very diſſolute and undiſciplined lives; their arrogance and ambition were frequently intolerable; and the laity, who had ſo many ſubjects of ſcandal before them, indulging the like carnal appetites, thought light of the moral duties of Religion, as not ſeeing them practiſed by thoſe who ſhould ſet the example; or whether or no they became remiſs in the obſervance of them, they deteſted, at any rate, the clergy for their immorality, and would have been glad to ſee their uſurped power in ſecular concerns annihilated. A Reformation, therefore in manners, was as much wanted as it was deſired by all good Catholics, whether eccleſiaſtics or laymen; for, though the corruption was great, yet numbers retained, unblemiſhed, the Spirit of Chriſt, and had not ſtooped their knee to the demons of pride, luſt, and avarice. The ancient Romans, when they inſtituted their republic, and committed the government of it, for a year only, to conſuls, alledged, as a reaſon for ſo doing*, that it

* Ne mora ſeneſceret imperium. FLOR.

it ſhould not grow feeble, languid, or infirm, like old age, by being continued too long in the ſame hands: but as this ſort of government cannot take place in eccleſiaſtical affairs, it were to be wiſhed, that, in imitation of it, there was ſome coerſive power to ſpirit up the executive part of Church diſcipline, in order to its ſtricter obſervance. This power ſhould be ſuppoſed to act at leaſt once a year, by a rigorous inquiry, whether the clergy have been punctual in the diſcharge of their reſpective duties; and whether they have given ſcandal or bad example, by immorality in life, or any doctrine or practice that may have a vicious tendency. 'Tis true, annual viſitations have been inſtituted for obtaining thoſe laudable ends; but it is thought, as the clergy have been generally found partial in their own favour, this care ſhould not be committed entirely to them; for if it is, the danger of Church government being relaxed, will conſtantly recur, and be always the cauſe, in weak minds, of defection from the faith and morality required by the Goſpel. It is infinitely better that ſcandal ſhould give offence, than truth be deſerted.

From this true ſtate of the caſe it appears what ſort of a Reformation was wanted; but as ſome turbulent ſpirits, from ſelfiſh views, are never eaſy, never ſatisfied, notwithſtanding all the reaſonable conceſſions that are made them, till they quite embroil affairs, and throw them into the utmoſt confuſion; a glaring inſtance of which we have in our Regicides of the laſt century: ſo the firſt Reformers, not content with invectives againſt the clergy, and the many abuſes committed in the Church in conſequence of their licentious conduct, proceeded to undermine the foundations of the very eſſence of Religion, firſt raiſing doubts about, and then peremptorily denying and rejecting ſeveral articles of faith, which, according to the beſt warrants of ſcripture and tradition, had been received and eſtabliſhed in the Church from the time of the apoſtles to that day. Luther, who firſt ſounded the alarm of Reformation in Germany, did it from a private pique to the court of Rome. Vexed that the Dominicans ſhould have intereſt enough to wreſt out of the hands of his brethren the Auguſtine friars, the diſtribution and preaching up of Indulgences, which for ſome time before had been aſſigned to them, he began to declaim againſt

againſt the abuſes of indulgences, which, indeed, were then very great, and cried aloud for redreſs. Luther ſo far was right, and acted the part of a good Catholic; but he did not ſtop here. His animoſity not allowing him to perceive, that an abuſe always argues the right uſe that may be made of a thing, he diſputed the right the Church had to grant Indulgences, called in queſtion the power of the Keys, and at laſt abſolutely denied the juriſdiction of the Pope. From his thus ſhaking off the authority of his lawful ſuperiors, ſprung, as from a very turbid ſource, all the other deluſions of his miſguided imagination; for a man, when he once ſets up for himſelf againſt a ſtrong party, combined to bring him to reaſon, muſt undertake ſomething extraordinary to create a belief of his importance. So it was with Luther: he forthwith broke through his vows of poverty, chaſtity, and obedience, which he ſays himſelf he had religiouſly kept for fifteen years together, and by marrying a nun, was acceſſary to her being guilty of the like prophanation. He ſoon publiſhed his errors concerning free-will, juſtification, and grace; he abuſed all his opponents in the moſt ſcandalous manner, particularly King Henry VIII.

of

of England; he diſcarded moſt of the ſacraments of the Church, calling St. James the apoſtle a * fool for recommending Extreme Unction; and he ingenuouſly confeſſed that he would have alſo rejected the Real Preſence in the Euchariſt, whereby he would have given the moſt fatal blow to Popery, were not the words of ſcripture too expreſs and ſtrong againſt him.

But this fatal blow, which he dared not to ſtrike himſelf, he ſaw, to his great mortification, given by Calvin, by Zuinglius at the head of the Sacramentarians, and by others, who all ſetting up likewiſe for themſelves, affected, as principals, a right to as much power and authority to decide matters of faith as Luther himſelf, deriding at the ſame time, and putting him and his notions at defiance. Here we perceive a motley ſuperſtructure of new fangled doctrines, raiſed upon thoſe of Luther; but the tenets of Calvin, in a more particular manner, are ſubverſive of all morality, if ſtrictly followed by his adherents. We cannot think

* Delirat Jacobus.

think otherwiſe when we ſeriouſly examine his explanations of Juſtification, Predeſtination and Reprobation. 'Tis true, in after times, thoſe of his ſect, either aſhamed of them, or ſliding into more plauſible modes of faith, endeavoured to dreſs them up in a more comely garb; yet that gloomineſs of thought, that paſſive ſtate of the ſoul in regard to virtue, that retroſpect to fataliſm, are ſuch ſtrong ingredients in the compoſition of a Calviniſt, that you muſt change the whole man before you can bring him over to the placid diſpoſition of an active Chriſtian.

The hatred of the firſt Reformers againſt the Catholic Church had not long continued, when it began, in ſome meaſure, to ſubſide, and vent itſelf, by a ſort of freſh vigour, againſt one another. It was natural for ſelf-ſufficient men, who had made themſelves heads of parties, to be jealous of, and even to hate thoſe who aſpired to the like prerogative: beſides, as their opinions were manifeſtly contradictory, it was an inſult on their pride to own that they were in the wrong. We need not wonder therefore, if they ſtigmatized each other with the moſt opprobrious appellations; and if, far from

from forming a coalition againſt their common enemy, the Catholics, they abſolutely declined it. What then was the iſſue of thoſe heart-burnings and feuds? Envy, malice, diſcord, confuſion, ſeditions, tumults, inſurrections, intolerance, perſecution; were all exerciſed more unrelentingly againſt each other than the Catholics; for the Catholics at that time being almoſt every where the governing civil power, were in a condition to repel force by force, ſo that at firſt the animoſity of the Reformers againſt them, could exert itſelf no otherwiſe than by ſome ſudden tumults and inſurrections. And, indeed, inſtead of allowing theſe Reformers to be men extraordinarily raiſed by God for teaching his law with greater truth and purity, we may well compare them to the Builders of the Tower of Babel, thoſe raſh and impious men, who meaſuring their narrow conceptions with omnipotence, deſigned to *make themſelves a name*, by erecting a tower, *whoſe top might reach unto heaven*; *but God went down, and there confounded their language, that they might not underſtand one anothers ſpeech.* Gen. ix. Their thoughts were ſo bewildered, their opinions ſo confounded, their dogmas ſo perplexed, that they were quite at a loſs

what

what to fix upon. Confeſſions upon confeſſions of faith were framed, but all to little purpoſe; there were ſtill diſſentients to claim the privilege of believing and worſhipping as they pleaſed. Let none imagine, that what is here alledged is unſupported by hiſtorical truth; the author writes from a full conviction, that the very facts exiſted, as may be ſeen very amply ſet forth in the Biſhop of Meaux's *Hiſtory of the Variations of the Proteſtants*, and in a little Tract, intitled, *Fifty Reaſons*, written by Prince Anthony Ulric of Brunſwick, one who was very intelligent in the Principles of the Lutherans and Calviniſts, and who had made the moſt diligent inquiry into the import of their ſeveral Confeſſions.

Who will now ſay that the finger of God was not here, and that the like fate will not wait, as it certainly does, all thoſe who ſpurn lawful authority, and ſet up their private judgment in oppoſition to the deciſions and unanimous voice of the Church of Chriſt? The unhappy conſequences of the Reformation, and the perpetual diſſenſions and diſagreements of the Reformed amongſt themſelves, are owing to nothing more than their aſſerting that the Scriptures

Scriptures are the only rule of faith, as every private man may underſtand and interpret them. By this latitude given for underſtanding and judging the ſenſe of the ſcriptures, without any unerring authority to have recourſe to and abide by, an inlet is made to almoſt as many religions as there are heads. We have ſeen alſo moſt of the ancient hereſies, condemned by the Catholic Church before the Reformation, revive and bud out anew in virtue of this rule of faith eſtabliſhed by the Reformation. I do not ſpeak of mere Deiſm. We have, alas! but too many here in England not aſhamed of that character, men dignified in Church and State; and as inferior claſſes of men are but too apt to ape the faſhions and ſentiments of their ſuperiors, we conſtantly ſee the tradeſman and mechanic ridiculing, with impunity, the moſt ſacred truths of ſcripture. Such are the bleſſings of the Goſpel-liberty of the Reformation, and ſuch its moſt delectable fruits! it is moſt certain, that ſcripture is and ſhould be the Rule of faith of all Chriſtians, and it is ſo acknowledged and revered by all Catholics; but ſcripture alone is not a competent rule of faith, as interpreted by this or that man, this or that head of a

ſect,

ſect, or this or that ſect taken collectively. Scripture is no otherwiſe the rule of faith, but as it has been interpreted by the apoſtles, their immediate ſucceſſors, and the primitive fathers of the Church. To their interpretation the Church has always inviolably adhered in the deciſions of her general councils; and theſe councils have the ſanction of ſupreme authority and infallibility derived from the power of Chriſt committed to his Church, and the promiſes he made "to guide her by the Holy Ghoſt in all truth, 'till the conſummation of all things." This is then the ſacred anchor of faith of all Catholics, and thoſe that do not hold to it, are liable to be "toſſed about by every wind of doctrine."

Let us now ſeriouſly reflect, whether it was not infinitely better and more conſonant to the ſpirit of a true Chriſtian, for the firſt Reformers to remain in the Church, and remedy, to their utmoſt, any abuſes complained of, than by ſeparating from her, to break the unity of faith. Nothing can juſtify Schiſm; nothing can palliate, much leſs excuſe, the offence of ſhaking off juſt authority. I remember to have read ſomewhere, many years ſince, an account

account (but cannot now recollect the name of the book) of a conference between Beza and Cardinal du Perron, on the motives of their reſpective ſeparation from the Communion they had been born and brought up in. Beza was originally a Catholic, and Cardinal du Perron a Calviniſt. You ſee, Mr. Beza, ſaid the Cardinal, a kind of diſparity in our preſent religious profeſſion: pray, inform me, what were your reaſons for quitting the Catholic Church? Beza alledged the many abuſes, corruptions, and errors, exiſting in the Church; ſome of which he had been an eye witneſs of himſelf, and others he had learned from the teſtimony and writings of perſons of veracity. To this he added, that to avoid the infection, he thought it more eligible to aſſociate with the Reformers, and labour with them to deſtroy what was noxious to true religion; confirming further what he ſaid by the authority of ſcripture, *Every plant which my heavenly father hath not planted ſhall be rooted up*, Matth. xv. 13.

I ſhould, from my heart, replied the Cardinal, applaud your notions, were they not too far led aſtray by the proud ſpirit of Schiſm. 'Tis very

ry true, that *every plant*, if you mean by it an article of faith, which God has not planted, *ſhall be rooted up*. All the power of the Catholic Church can neither make nor enforce an article of faith that is repugnant to the word of God; and all thoſe who at any time have perſuaded others into a belief contrary to the word of God; the Church, by the power and authority of God committed to her to judge of the true ſenſe of his word, has condemned that belief, and has immediately endeavoured to eradicate it. But you muſt grant me that there is a wide difference between an article of faith, as ſuch, acknowledged by the whole Church, and the abuſe of that article of faith, the corruption of it, or an error of judgment in explaining it, by a ſingle perſon, or perhaps more. An article of faith, as ſuch, is, as it ſtands decided by the whole Church, to be conformable to the word of God; but the ſame article of faith may be abuſed and corrupted by wicked men to ſerve wicked purpoſes; or for want of right underſtanding it, may be interpreted in a wrong ſenſe, though the party or parties, at the ſame time, may have no intention to err. I allow that the abuſes, corruptions, and errors you complain of, have exiſted,

iſted, do now partly exiſt, for aught I know, and may ſtill exiſt, among ſeveral who profeſs themſelves members of the Church; and that as noxious weeds they deſerve to be rooted up; but I deny that they effect the eſſence of faith which always does and will remain inviolate and incorrupt. There may be alſo opinions, doctrines and points of Diſcipline of the Church, which have not obtained the ſanction of articles of faith, perverted by bad men to encourage bad practices. The ſame may be ſaid of the opinions and doctrines of particular doctors of the Church. A Reformer, of candour, can no more draw conſequences from them to the prejudice of the faith of the Catholic Church, than a Catholic of the ſame turn of mind can, from the particular dogmas of the Reformed divines, to the prejudice of the confeſſions of faith eſtabliſhed by the Reformed ſynods. If an attack is made, it ſhould be made on what is real, ſubſtantial, and ſtands confeſſed on either ſide, and not on the mere abuſes, corruptions, and errors. which wicked or weak minds have been, perhaps, induſtrious to propagate. It is the part of a good Catholic Chriſtian to labour ſtrenouſly in the vineyard of the Lord, and to be vigilent in rooting up every ſick, weak, or

corrupt

corrupt plant, and in lopping off every rotten or uſeleſs branch: all abuſes, corruptions, and errors in points of faith and doctrine, are of this kind, and, as not planted by God, ſhould be rooted up; but who will pretend to root up the plants the heavenly Father has planted? Theſe plants, as articles of faith of the Catholic Church, bear good and delicious fruits; and it is the buſineſs of the Reformer, before he attempts to prune off a bearing branch, or root up a vigorous plant, to bring full conviction of its ſterility; otherwiſe he muſt diſcover his want of ſkill, and that he is very inſufficient to labour in the culture of Chriſt's vineyard.

Now, Sir, added the Cardinal, to take a nearer view of your reaſons for relinquiſhing the Communion of the Catholic Church, they ſeem to aim at more directly the corrupt and ſuperſtitious practices of ſome monks and friars, than any univerſally acknowledged point of faith in the Church. You have recounted to me the extravagant pitch they have brought the Devotion of the bleſſed Virgin to, together with that of the patron ſaints of their orders; and as other conſequences of the doctrine of the invocation of ſaints, and the veneration of

their

their relics and images, you have enumerated many pious frauds and juggles: the ſtrange legends that have been invented, the heavenly viſions that were pretended to, the miracles that were forged, and a multiplicity of other abſurdities to delude the minds of the unwary and ignorant, and keep them in a ſtate of dependence.

I allow all theſe allegations to be, in a great degree, true: I am quite aſhamed of them, and am exceeding ſorry that ſuch abuſes have ever crept into the Church. As to the monks and friars, it cannot be denied, but that many of them have been very learned men, and eminent for true ſanctity and integrity of life: others of them, whoſe intellects had been weak, took a wrong bias from a ſort of myſtic devotion, that had inſenſibly gained ground among them; and others have done unſeemly things, *turpis lucri gratiâ*. But do you think that theſe abuſes, all proceeding from the depravity of man's heart, or the imbecility of his underſtanding, invalidate the eſſence of faith? No, the Church teaches, but does not eſtabliſh as an article of faith, that it is good and profitable to beg the interceſſion of the ſaints that reign

reign with Chriſt in his glory, declaring her intention that every prayer ſhould be immediately directed to God, through Jeſus Chriſt, who reigneth with Him in the unity of the Holy Ghoſt. The Church alſo, from the ſame motives, recommends the uſe of Indulgences, for mitigating the temporal puniſhment due to ſin: the retaining of images and paintings for the purpoſes of decoration of churches, and as memorials of the triumphs of Chriſt and his ſaints; and the veneration of the relics of ſaints, as once the temples of the Holy Ghoſt. The Church, at any time, may ſet aſide all theſe particulars as unneceſſary, without hurting her faith; and conſidering them only as implements for exciting devotion ſooner than that a brother, weak in faith, ſhould be ſcandalized, or that an open might be made for abuſe, and the ſeduction of minds, it would be better if all images, relics, and the like, were quite annihilated by fire or otherwiſe, provided no contempt was implied by ſo doing.

*Therefore thou art inexcuſable, O man, for wherein thou judgeſt, thou condemneſt thyſelf,* Rom. ii. 1. Nothing, Sir, can juſtify you, as a Schiſmatic; if there were abuſes in the Church, you

you ſhould have remained in the Church to rectify them. If you was conveniently lodged in a magnificent palace, richly and beautifully adorned, would you deſert it, if a few beaſts had entered by ſome means into the hall, and defiled it with their ordure? No, a man of ſenſe, ſooner than deſert ſo good and noble an habitation, would immediately ſet about clearing out the filth, and would prevent, if poſſible, ſuch unclean animals from entering there again. The Church of Chriſt, a Church firmly founded upon a rock, "againſt which the gates of hell ſhall never prevail," is that magnificent and ſpacious palace, which is open to receive you again, like the prodigal child, with love and tenderneſs. Return to it, leſt *after thy hardneſs and impenitent heart, thou treaſure up unto thyſelf wrath againſt the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, ſeek for glory and honour, and immortality; eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteouſneſs; indignation and wrath.* Rom. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8.

For

For my part, I have always thought with St. Paul, that *Chriſt cannot be* divided, 1 Cor. i. 13. and that all Chriſtians ſhould *be perfectly joined together in the ſame mind, and in the ſame judgment*, ibid. 10. and therefore on the approaches of death, I hope with the grace of God, to be able to ſay to myſelf, *I have fought a good fight, I have finiſhed my courſe, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteouſneſs, which the Lord the righteous judge ſhall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them alſo that love his appearing.* 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.

## CHAP. IV.

*The ſame Argument continued, with a Review of the grounds for eſtabliſhing the Reformation in England.*

"THOUGH the Lord," ſays St. Auguſtin *, diſputing againſt the Manicheans, "overthrows the kingdom of error "by his ſervants, yet he commands that men,



* Contra epiſtolam fundamenti.

" conſidered as men, ſhould be inſtructed and " ſet right, not deſtroyed. Let thoſe be an- " gry with you, who know not the difficulty " of coming at truth, and avoiding error. " Let thoſe be angry with you, who know " not the difficulty of curing the mind's eye, " and enabling it to bear the light of its pro- " per ſun. Let thoſe be angry with you, " who know not with what groaning and " pains the leaſt knowledge of the Deity is " acquired." This paſſage of St. Auguſtin is a great leſſon to all Chriſtians, a leſſon dictated from the benevolent effuſions of the heart, that they ſhould ſhew pity to one another by forbearance, rather than enmity by perſecution; that they ſhould inſtruct and ſet right thoſe who are unhappily engaged in error, rather than deſtroy without endeavouring to reclaim them by inſtruction. This is the command of God, and whoever acts contrary to it, declares himſelf to be an infractor of it. This is the intention of the Catholic Church, conformable to the command of God. She has always ſtruggled hard to overthrow the kingdom of error by God's ſervants, the Faithful; yet, purſuant to God's command, ſhe has always conſidered men as men, objects

of

of inſtruction and not of wrath. When ſhe has found it difficult in curing the mind's eye, to diſpel the miſt that obſtructed its clearer ſight, its blindneſs ſtill ſmote her with compaſſion, and ſhe ſtill hoped that a ray of reflection, deſcending from the Father of lights, would at length enable it to bear the light of the ſun of faith.

If the reader is pleaſed to look back to the ſecond chapter, he will find that what is here inculcated by St. Auguſtin, is there alſo, in regard to the ſpirit of the Catholic Church, as to the manner of condemning hereſy, which cannot be conſtrued into a deſign of favouring Perſecution; ſo that, when a Proteſtant objects that ſuch a pope, biſhop, or prieſt, connived at, or openly or occultly was the abettor of Perſecution; or that ſuch a Catholic prince deſtroyed ſo many Proteſtants in his ſtates, whom he judged to be perturbators of the public peace, and enemies to his goverment; or that ſuch a body of Catholic men combined to rid themſelves of injury and oppreſſion, by murdering ſome Proteſtants, the authors of all their diſtreſſes and calamities: when a Proteſtant, I ſay, in this manner, charges the

whole body of the Catholic Church with the ſame diſpoſition, he makes a very unfair and unlogical induction. The depravity here lies in man's heart, and in his vindictive ſpirit. He diſobeys the command of God that counſels him patience and long-ſuffering; and he does not conſider, that "vengeance is the Lord's, and that he will repay."

Perſecution cannot therefore be imputed to the Catholic Church; for the univerſal ſpirit of benevolence that diſplays itſelf in her ſentiments, excludes from her every idea of the kind. The Proteſtant may affect the ſame ſpirit of univerſal benevolence; but his motives, rather purely human, than directed to the honour of God, and the ſeeking of his glory, ſhew that the character but ill ſuits him. Self-intereſt is the predominant paſſion in the Proteſtant, wherever he has found an eſtabliſhment; and to ſecure this eſtabliſhment, and remove from his conſcience the incumbrance of reſtraint, he will perſecute all opponents who dare to diſpute his pretenſions. Hiſtory furniſhes us with numerous inſtances, which cannot be queſtioned, of Proteſtant vowing revenge againſt Proteſtants, and executing

cuting it ſeverely. Lutherans have perſecuted Calviniſts, Calviniſts Lutherans, and both have joined to perſecute Anabaptiſts, Quakers, and others. Where one ſect had gained the maſtery over another, there was no toleration; and there would be little even at this day, where an eſtabliſhment is fixed, were it not for the interpoſition of the authority of princes. If then Proteſtants can perſecute thoſe whom they muſt own as their brethren, by a better reaſon they will all conjointly perſecute Catholics; for the maxim "of * hating thoſe you have injured," will hold good in human prudence, though oppoſite to Chriſtian charity.

It would lead too far to paſs in review all the perſecutions of Proteſtants againſt themſelves and Catholics, in whatever part of the world they have been raiſed and exerciſed; ſo that it ſeems moſt adviſable to confine our examitation, on this head, to what has been tranſacted at home, becauſe it may be ſuppoſed that there are but few among us unacquainted with our own hiſtory.



* Proprium eſt odiſſe quem læſeris. PUB. SYR.

King Henry VIII. was the firſt here in England that authorized, in his own perſon, the breaking of the unity of the faith. He pretended ſcruples on account of his having married his brother's wife, though he had long cohabited with her, had ſeveral children by her, and had declared that ſhe came a virgin to his bed. One ſhould think that, according to the law of the Goſpel, and the regulations that had taken place among Chriſtians, ſince the eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity; the incapacity of contracting and conſummating marriage with a ſecond wife during the life of the firſt, was a ſufficient bar to him. Though Catherine was married to his brother Arthur, yet as her marriage was never conſummated with Arthur, Henry could entertain no real ſcruple of living in inceſt; for it is conſummation that compleats the validity of matrimony; therefore what God had ſo joined, no power on earth could ſeparate. The Pope was earneſtly ſollicited by the court of England to grant a divorce, but this was a point his diſpenſing power could not reach. It was ſuperſeded by the poſitive word of God, and all the canons and conſtitutions of the Church that were in force upon the article of matrimony.

Suppoſing,

Suppoſing, however, the Pope could grant a divorce, yet by ſo doing he muſt eſtabliſh a very ill precedent; becauſe every prince acknowledging his diſpenſing power, would, upon any frivolous pretext of putting away his wife, expect the ſame indulgence as Henry: even the nobles of the land would think they were intitled to a like privilege, and of courſe it would become faſhionable among the commonalty. Beſides the Pope, the principal univerſities, and the moſt eminent divines in Europe, were tampered with; but none were found, notwithſtanding the lure of all-powerful gold, to belye their conſciences, or openly ſecond the deſigns of Henry. What ſhould he do under this dilemma? love, engaging love, prompting him on one ſide, and ſurly religion checking him on the other. We may preſume that he was very deeply enamoured, nay, as deeply ſmitten with the charms of Anne Boleyn, as Virgil deſcribes Dido to be with the proweſs and other excellencies of Eneas:

*Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.*

But we ſhould always put the beſt conſtruction on things, and not imagine that it was mere love for Anne Boleyn that had ſo rivetted itſelf

in the King's heart. The dame was not ſo coy, neither was her virtue ſo tranſcendant, as not to be contented with the condition of a handmaid, if ſhe could not aſpire to that of a wife. We may therefore think that Catherine, affording no great proſpect of having any more children, the King deſponded of being ſucceeded by heirs male, and therefore became uneaſy. He perhaps alſo diſliked, that in caſe of his daughter Mary's death without iſſue, his crown ſhould devolve to the iſſue of either his two ſiſters. But here human prudence will not exculpate him; he ſhould in conſcience, and with an humble mind, have conſidered his caſe in common with many other illuſtrious kings and princes; he ſhould have ſuffered Providence to act; he did not know what was reſerved for him and his family in the ways of Providence, and conſequently he ought not to have attempted to anticipate its deſigns. But Henry's philoſophy was now ſo bent upon the medium of ſecond cauſes, and Anne Boleyn's good fleſh and blood (a reaſon alſo aſſigned for his marriage with Jane Seymour) was ſo tempting a bait for exciting deſire, and withal did bid ſo fair towards the production of a vigorous male offspring, that

nothing

nothing could reſtrain him from executing the purpoſe of his ſoul. We now behold the "Defender of the Faith," a title beſtowed on him by the Pope for defending it againſt Luther, aſcend, by a quick gradation, to be ſupreme Head of the Church of England under Chriſt. All Europe was aſtoniſhed at this unparalleled ambition, or rather preſumption. The Catholics exclaimed againſt it, the Reformers ſcoffed at it. Some inſinuated that he wanted to introduce Mohammedaniſm into England, and that to ſhew himſelf the good muſſulman, and father of the faithful, he choſe to be a Kaliph, or King and Pontiff, dignified both by the crown and the tiara. Others were impatient to have the honour of ſeeing him celebrate his firſt Maſs *in Pontificalibus*; but were at the ſame time apprehenſive, that the very moment he touched the cenſer he would be ſmitten with leproſy, as Uzziah, King of Judah was, for a like encroachment on the prieſtly office. Such were the ludicrous animadverſions on King Henry's Papacy, or as it was otherwiſe called, keeping a Pope in his belly. But let us attend to Calvin's opinion of it, in his commentary upon the thirteenth verſe of the ſeventh chapter of the book

of the prophet Amos. Theſe are his words:* "They who at firſt ſo greatly extolled Henry, "King of England, were certainly very in-"conſiderate; they complimented him with "the ſupreme power over all things: this has "always given me a great deal of concern. "For it was blaſphemy in them to call him "ſupreme Head of the Church under Chriſt, "and certainly more than they could juſtify." No Proteſtant will ſuſpect Calvin's opinion of the regal Supremacy in England to be biaſſed by any malicious deſign. He wrote from a full conviction of his mind; he judged that it was ſupreme arrogance, that it was blaſphemy, and that no man living could juſtify it. The ridicule and abſurdity became greater, when the ſame title and power of the ſupreme Head of the Church under Chriſt, devolved to his daughter † Elizabeth: for, if the identity

* Qui initio tantopere extulerunt Henr cum Regem Angliæ, certé fuerunt inconſiderati homines, dederunt illi ſummam rerum omnium poteſtatem; & hoc me ſemper graviter vulneravit; erant enim blaſphemi cum vocarent eum ſummum Caput Eccleſiæ ſub Chriſto, hoc certe fuit nimium.

† Queen Elizabeth is ſaid to have impoſed her hands on archbiſhop Whitgift, and others her biſhops, at the time

indentity of a She-pope, or pope Joan among the Catholics, remains a matter of doubt and could never be proved, it is not ſo with the identity of a pope Elizabeth, a pope Mary II. and a pope Anne in England. Theſe were real Popes in petticoats, and Popes in their own right; unleſs we ſuppoſe the papacy ſuffered a ſubdiviſion between William III. and Mary II. and ſo became androgynous, partaking of both ſexes, till the death of Mary again re-inſtated it in the powers of virility.

But raillery apart. Let us touch upon the nature of the power that inveſted King Henry VIII. with this high-ſounding prerogative, this blaſphemous juriſdiction as Calvin calls it, and diſſolved his marriage with Catherine of Arragon. What was the power that was able to effect theſe mighty matters? it was nothing more than the Parliament of England: an aſſembly of men that acknowledge themſelves fallible; for if they did not, they would not ſo

---

time of their conſecration. This ſtory, however, may deſerve a place in the Scandalous Chronicle. See the Politician's Catechiſm, firſt printed by Fitz-Herbert, and reprinted by N. N. in 1658.

ſo often have reſcinded their own Acts. An aſſembly of men, intirely calculated for judging and deciding in civil matters, and for enacting laws for the purpoſes of good government, according to the ſeveral contingencies of temporal concerns. But theſe ſame men could venture out of their latitude, and what the conſciences of all the reſt of Chriſtendom abhorred as unjuſtifiable, they, with a compoſure of conſcience, and acquieſcence of mind in well-doing, brought to paſs. We muſt now regard them as perfect judges of the meaning of ſcripture; and that having deduced proper concluſions from the premiſſes they had laid down, they came to this final deciſion: "*It ſeemed good unto the Holy Ghoſt and to us,* "Acts xv. 28. that the marriage of our King, "Henry VIII. with Catherine of Arragon, "is inceſtuous, and therefore we diſſolve it. "Alſo, that the ſame King and his ſucceſſors, "and not Peter, are the rock on which Chriſt "built his Church, and are the very perſons "to whom he gave the charge of feeding his "ſheep and lambs, and therefore we conſti-"tute them ſupreme Heads of the Church "under Chriſt." From the proceedings of King Henry VIII's parliament, ſuch a blaſphemous

phemous conſequence as this may be drawn and it is the very thing that revolted to ſuch a degree the minds of all good Catholics, and filled Calvin and moſt of the Catholics with ſo much concern. But in juſtification of this parliament, it may be ſaid, that though there were many who compoſed it, well verſed in the art of adulation, and knew by it how to recommend themſelves to the good graces of the King, yet others would not have turned out quite ſo obſequious, were they not intimidated by the arbitrary frowns of a tyrant, whoſe character, was, *to ſpare no man in his wrath, nor woman in his luſt.* There were, however, ſome, men of the ſtricteſt integrity, whom no menaces could over-awe into a compliance. The cauſe of God, and his religion, was debated, and they were reſponſible to him if they ſhamefully deſerted it. Out of theſe I ſelect Sir Thomas Moore and Cardinal Fiſher, Biſhop of Rocheſter. Lord Somers, in juſtifying the Revolution and the ſucceſſion of King William III. availed himſelf of their arguments in favour of the right of Parliament to ſettle the ſucceſſion, whom in ſuch civil reſpects the people are bound in conſcience to obey, and muſt not pretend to inquire whether what

what they have done is upon juſt grounds. I ſhall quote Lord Somers's own words. "'Tis "well known, ſays he, how reſolutely, even "to death, they refuſed the oath of ſucceſ- "ſion, which the parliament had framed, be- "cauſe therein the King's ſupremacy was a- "vowed; and, therefore, they cannot be ſuſ- "pected to diſſemble, when, at the very ſame "time they declared, that if that ſupremacy was "left out, they would willingly ſwear an oath "to maintain the ſucceſſion of the crown to "the iſſue of the King's preſent marriage, as "it was then eſtabliſhed by Parliament; for "which they gave this reaſon, that this was "in the power of a parliament to determine, "but not who was ſupreme Head of the "Church. Sir Thomas went farther, and "owned a very ſtrange opinion of their power "in this point, but he ſays it expreſly at "the ſame time, that the parliament had un- "queſtionable authority in ordering of the ſuc- "ceſſion; and that the people were bound to "obey them therein."——These great and good men ſuffered death for their oppoſition to the King's meaſures: they were clear in their opinion, that the law of God was on their ſide, and could not be made void by any law

of

of man; and as they lived innocently, ſo they died without regret. The reſt of King Henry's reign was equally formidable to the Catholics and Reformers; each party in their turn, felt his rod of perſecution, and neither were ſince found inclined to compliment his memory with the leaſt encomium.

After his death his maxims of government, with his ſupremacy, deſcended to his ſon Edward VI. The Reformers now began to rally their dejected ſpirits; but the grandees falling out among themſelves, firſt, who ſhould engroſs the greater quantity of abbey-lands; and next, who ſhould have moſt power; the unhappy King, whoſe youth, like wax, was moulded into any ſhape, and form, at the fancy of his inſolent governors, fell a victim by ſlow poiſon, in the conteſt, after he had been drawn into a ſettlement in favour of Jane Grey, a young lady of many amiable qualities, but infected with the heterodox notions of the Hot-Goſpellers, as the Proteſtants were then called. Her kingdom was overthrown in nine days time, which occaſioned the bye-word of *a nine days wonder*, ever ſince made uſe of in England to expreſs ſomething extraodinary,

like

like a blazing meteor, that cannot long ſubſiſt. Mary then ſucceeding, purſuant to the will of her father, to whom the parliament had granted leave to ſettle the ſucceſſion in that manner, procured all the acts of her father and brother, that tended to the diſadvantage of the Catholic religion, to be abraogated. Her parliament was as obſequious to her in aboliſhing the regal ſupremacy, as it was before to her father, and afterwards again to her ſiſter, in eſtabliſhing it; which ſhews that this grand and favourite article of the Church of England's Creed, is truly more an emanation from the caprice of princes on one ſide, and the baſe flattery of the ſubject on the other, than the work and appointment of God.

Conſidering the Character of Queen Elizabeth, the next ſucceſſor, in a political light, and according to the meaſure of rectitude that ſeems ſo deſirable for compleating the views of mere human prudence, we ſhall find it ſuperior to all praiſe; great and glorious, indeed! an object worthy the ſtudy of the wiſeſt princes, and at the ſame time a reproach to them, whenever the conſcious thought leads them to reflect, that the manly ſenſe of a woman has excelled

excelled theirs in the art of government. Reverſe this character, or rather place it in oppoſition to the ways of the world, with a tendency to the ways of God, and you will diſcover its aſpect to be very ill favoured: you will, in fine, perceive it to betray ſo many diſtempered ſymptoms, that you cannot help judging it to be unſound or unhealthy.

Elizabeth in aſcending the throne of England, took an oath to defend and maintain the Catholic religion, as the only and truly eſtabliſhed religion of the ſtate. Something very extraordinary muſt be the occaſion of her afterwards falſifying this oath, which, purſuant to the intention of ſtipulated contracts, ſuppoſed in the preſence of God, to be fully ſufficient to bind man to man, was undoubtedly a ſolemn promiſe and ſacred engagement, not raſhly to be violated, and the rather, as made to a whole people. The ſequel will ſhew, firſt, that it was not conſcience that compelled her to break through this covenant. Secondly, it was not the prejudice of education; for though in defence of her father's marriage with Anne Boleyn, and conſequently of her own legitimacy, ſhe might give into the notions

tions of regal ſupremacy; yet, as no alteration had been made in other points of the Catholic faith, during her father's reign, and as but a ſlight deviation did juſt appear in the reign of her brother, ſuch faint ſhadows could not make her loſe ſight of the ſubſtance; neither could they make any ſtrong impreſſions upon her, in the form of an uncatholic education. Thirdly, it was not good policy in her, conſidering the ſtate and diſpoſition of the people of England; the difficulty, if not danger, of overthrowing an eſtabliſhed religion; and the hazard of loſing her own reputation. Eccleſiaſtical matters had been ſo ordered in the preceding reign, and ſo ſevere a check kept, in complaiſance to Queen Mary, by the adminiſtration, upon the Reformers and the ſpreading of their doctrines, that at Queen Elizabeth's acceſſion, no other religion but the Catholic could pretend to the ſanction of an eſtabliſhbliſhment. The Reformed, however, were ſtill pretty numerous, but they dared not openly avow their principles; they likewiſe wanted ſome powerful head to encourage them, and for want of ſuch they were only like embers buried under aſhes. Elizabeth was ſenſible of their impotent condition to blaze forth afreſh,

afreſh, and who ſhould preſume, without her concurrence, to rake into thoſe aſhes, and add fuel to their collected fire? She knew how well the people of England have always ſtood affected to the immediate heirs of their princes; and notwithſtanding her father had cauſed her and her ſiſter to be baſterdiſed by his parliament, yet, as the ſame parliament had again legitimated them to ſucceed in reverſion, as ſpecified by his will, there was nothing to hinder her ſucceſſion; and all were ready to receive her as their legal and rightful Queen. Conſidering therefore, I ſay, this diſpoſition of the people, the difficulty, if not danger, of overthrowing an eſtabliſhed religion, and the loſs of her own reputation in receding from ſo ſolemn a promiſe confirmed by oath, it may be believed with good reaſon, ſhe would, in conſequence of the intention of that oath, have preſerved and mainteined the Catholic religion. had not ſome things intervened which might have ruined her if ſhe had.

I ſpeak here of human views, human meaſures human intereſts; for it is the nature of mankind, I do not ſay of all in general, but of the far greater part, to ſeclude the proſpect

of

of eternal welfare, when ſet in competition with that which is temporal. The one is to come, the other is preſent: the one may be deemed an abſtracted or ſpeculative notion, anticipated only by deſire and hope; the other is ſubſtantial, and recommended by the charms of actual enjoyment. On this foundation Religion is frequently poſtponed, nay even ſacrificed to intereſt and reaſon of ſtate. This was the real and extraordinary cauſe that urged Elizabeth to ſet aſide the obligation of her oath, and ſhe would, with all her heart, have preſerved the Catholic religion, but it was not her intereſt ſo to do. I ſhall not, on this occaſion, accuſe her of the *lubido dominandi*, that luſt after power, which *per fas atque nefas*, by all manner of means, weather licit or illicit, inſtigates to promote the happineſs of ſecurity. No, I examine her as acting according to contingencies. The people of England called upon her to inherit a crown, which was her right in virtue of her father's will, ratified by parliament; and it was natural to her to preſerve to herſelf that right againſt all opponents that conteſted it. But let us ſee the beginning, progreſs, and iſſue of this affair.

The

The Popes at this time ſtill affected a power which they had exerciſed for ſome centuries paſt, of diſpoſing of the crowns of princes: at leaſt, they required that all the princes of their communion ſhould do homage to them for their crowns, and accept them as a ſort of fee from the See of Rome. The princes, that for certain reaſons found it expedient to acknowledge this power in the popes, became, in a great meaſure, dependent on them; whilſt others, juſtly reſenting it as an impoſition, eſteemed their crowns and the prerogatives annexed to them, as rights devolving to them by hereditary deſcent, or conferred on them by the free voice of the people: they therefore diſclaimed all ſuch papal incroachments, holding themſelves reſponſible to God only, and their people for their conduct. The contentions, not only on this head, but alſo with regard to the right of inveſtitures, proceeding immediately from, or granted in fee of the See of Rome, were the ſource of many diſorders in Church and State; and many acts of parliament were paſſed here in England long before the Reformation, to reſtrain any papal authority that interfered with theſe or other our national concerns. However, as the

the Pope was held by all Chriſtian princes before the introduction of proteſtantiniſm, to be the Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt upon earth, in quality of his being the ſucceſſor of St. Peter, the prince of the apoſtles; as he was alſo reputed the common father of all the faithful, and the arbitrator, umpire, and mediator of all the differences of princes among themſelves, and with their ſubjects: it was cuſtomary even with thoſe princes who were jealous of their independency, to notify to the Pope their acceſſion to the crowns of their reſpective kingdoms, both for his approbation, and a further confirmation, of their right. Our Elizabeth, in obedience to this cuſtom, diſpatched her Envoy to the court of Rome: but what was his reception, and how unwelcome was the news he imparted to his royal miſtreſs? The Pope gave her the opprobrious name of Baſtard; he proteſted he would revoke none of his predeceſſors bulls, that condemned the proceedings of her father and brother; he pronounced her to be guilty of preſumption in aſcending the throne; and declared ſhe muſt not expect the leaſt favour, if ſhe did not relinquiſh her pretenſions, and abide entirely by the deciſion of the Holy See. This was carrying things to

an

an unjuſtifiable exceſs in the court of Rome; the uſage was too hard; and as no mitigation of it was likely to be hoped for, it forced Elizabeth, contrary to her inclination, into the arms of the Proteſtant party. There was no other alternative that ſuited her intereſt. If ſhe had continued ſtedfaſt to the Catholic religion, ſhe muſt have acknowledged herſelf indebted for her crown to the ſpecial favour and condeſcenſion of the court of Rome, and as a conſequence of this indulgence ſhewn her, ſhe muſt have allowed the illegality, of her father's marriage with Anne Boleyn. Here ſhe could not help being under a ſtrange dilemma; for the grant of a crown from the See of Rome could not ſave her, in the eyes of the world, from being an uſurper, the moment ſhe owned herſelf illegitimate; becauſe it is well known, that in ſucceſſions taking place in virtue of hereditaty right, a baſtard cannot exclude a legitimate heir, without making void a fundamental law of the ſtate, and conſequently without becoming an undoubted uſurper.

It is thought by ſome, that notwithſtanding theſe terrible menaces thundered at our Elizabeth from the Vatican, they would all have termi-

terminated in a *brutum fulmen*, if, ſtill adhering to the Catholic religion, ſhe ſeemed to take no notice of them, and repoſed herſelf on the love and fidelity of her ſubjects, to aſcertain and defend her right and title to the crown, as they had before, by law, readily concurred to eſtabliſh them. This might be a good political conjecture, for a cotemporary with Queen Elizabeth, and for one that was not in the ſecret of her affairs; but for us who, at this diſtance of time, are more inclined to bring real ſchemes and facts, than apparent ones, to a ſcrutiny: we, I ſay, who from hiſtorical monuments have been able to penetrate into the inmoſt receſſes of the cabinets of princes, may be well allowed to think otherwiſe.

The Pope had already taken his meaſures, and he too had his intereſt to ſerve. The plan was laid, which he heartily concurred with, for dethroning Elizabeth, and giving away her crown to the Dauphin of France, married to Mary, Queen of Scots. It was not love for the Catholic religion, or view of conſulting its ſecurity, that prevailed upon the Pope to ſecond this project: no, all the intrigues of the court of France, and all its careſſes, would

have

have been ineffectual, had not the power of the King of Spain made him desirous to waken it as much as possible, or find some safeguard against it. As he dreaded this power, it was natural for him to hate it; and therefore the union of France and England seemed to him a very desirable object to counteract, if not entirely to blast King Philip's designs of universal monarchy, whilst at the same time it would add more weight and authority to the See of Rome, by its being still able to retain an influence over, and guide the motions of the political ballance.

King Philip, on his side, was remarkable for a stretch of very refined politics; and it may be said of him, that he had more real hatred for France than zeal for the Catholic religion. Were it not for this hatred, Queen Elizabeth would never have sat upon the throne of England. He saved her life, when she was supposed to be concerned in the treason of Wiatt and Stafford, which last on his success, she is said to have agreed to marry. He also saved her life, when she was suspected of countenancing the doctrines of the Reformers. Queen Mary and her council had

come to a reſolution to have her put to death on this occaſion; and though the charge was not clear againſt her, yet it was judged adviſable to execute what they had reſolved, by way of preventing any future miſchief to the eſtabliſhed religion. But Philip and his Spaniards with great earneſtneſs oppoſed this reſolution: "They repreſented Elizabeth as "extremely well affected to the Catholic cauſe; "that the unhappy circumſtances of her birth "were the only grounds for raiſing ſiniſter "ſuſpicions to her prejudice; that it was not "rational to deem her accountable for the "caprices of her father, that the laws of the "land had wiped off the ſtain of her illegiti-"macy; that he (Philip) as King-conſort, "reputed himſelf in conſcience a guardian of "thoſe laws; and that it would ſully his re-"putation, and be a means of queſtioning his "integrity, if he conſented to the death of a "Princeſs, who had an immediate right to "the ſucceſſion after his Queen, if ſhe left no "iſſue. For, though innocent himſelf of "her blood, he could not eſcape the cenſure "of the world, as having privately ſome de-"ſigns of his own on the Engliſh monarchy." Theſe remonſtrances of King Philip, which

he

he is reported to have delivered with a ſtern and peremptory air, calmed in ſome degree, the apprehenſions the Queen and her council were in of Elizabeth's deſerting the Catholic faith, and in the end proved deciſive of her worldly felicity, in obtaining the crown. Some have conſidered Philip as enamoured of Elizabeth, and that his fine ſpeech in her defence, was calculated with a view to induce her to a return of love by marriage with him after Mary's death, the ſtate of that Queen's health being then very precarious. But the truth is, his endeavours to extricate Elizabeth from danger, were a mere fineſſe to clear the way of all obſtruction to his own political devices. He was ſenſible, that Mary Queen of Scots, with her French connections, would not be a fit Queen of England for his purpoſe; and therefore it was found policy in him to preſerve the ſucceſſion to Elizabeth, even at the hazard of her eſtabliſhing Proteſtancy in England. The event verified his conduct. He is ſaid to be the firſt that tranſmitted to her the intelligence of the cauſe of her diſgrace at Rome, deſiring her to guard againſt the French, and purſue the meaſures that beſt ſuited her intereſt; and yet this prince, notwithſtanding ſuch ſem-

blance of friendſhip, could afterwards pretend a zeal for religion, and undertake to dethrone her by his armada; but the very Pope, Sixtus V. that had excommunicated Elizabeth, became on this emergency her faſt friend, and conſtant correſpondent: he helped to baffle Philip's plots, though concerted with all imaginable ſecreſy, to inſure ſucceſs; and ſo great was his averſion to him, that it gave him a more ſingular pleaſure to ſee hereſy maintained in England, than to ſee Philip become maſter of it.

Some will be ſcandalized, imagining Popes particularly, from their ſacred function, incapable of ſuch duplicity of conduct, pretending to ſerve God and yet ſerving mammon: but in ſtriving to ſearch after truth, we muſt paint Man as he is, and not as he ought to be. A Pope, it is certain, ſhould be attentive to nothing but the ſpiritual welfare of the Faithful in general; all other avocations degrade the dignity of the character of the Pontiff and Holy Father. Many Popes, however, reputing themſelves temporal as well as ſpiritual princes, preſume they ſhould be allowed to have likewiſe an intereſt to ſerve on the footing

ing of temporal concerns. No one will doubt but that they have; and as men subject to frailties like others, perhaps too ardent a desire of promoting the temporal interest, may make them lose sight of the spiritual. Sixtus, long before he had favoured Queen Elizabeth against the Spanish invasion, gave several evident proofs of his favour to the Protestants in France, in opposition to the Spaniards that supported the League; insomuch that the Spaniards * threatened loudly to protest against him, and provide otherwise for the preservation of the Church which he had abandoned. More recent instances of a similar behaviour appear in the Popes Clement X. and Innocent XI. The first was governed entirely by Cardinal Altieri, who strained every nerve to thwart Lewis XIV. and check the rapidity of his conquests in the United Netherlands in 1672. The second considering our James II. as linked in counsels with France, was deaf to all his sollicitations for giving a sanction to the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in England. Nothing that was encouraged in France



* Mainbourg Hist. de la Ligue.

could be reliſhed by that Pope. Fearing to be cruſhed by the too great power Lewis XIV. ſeemed to graſp at, he was always glad when the Proteſtant powers were in a condition to bridle and reduce it.

Hence we ſee that princes are governed by intereſt, even frequently in direct oppoſition to conſcience; and that this intereſt can be ſometimes made, by dexterous management, to work ſo effectually on the minds of the people, as, in the caſe of Queen Elizabeth, that they will fondly imagine it to be their own, and ſubmit themſelves to be governed by it. Queen Elizabeth gained over far more proſelytes to eſpouſe her intereſt, and abjure the court of Rome for its unſeemly treatment of her, than ſhe could expect if ſhe had declared herſelf immediately a Proteſtant at her ſucceſſion; ſo true it is, that the ſufferer of wrongs creates a pity which reverts in hatred againſt the doer of them.

The die was now caſt, ſhe had alſo paſſed the Rubicon, and there was no retracting. A free toleration was granted at home to preach up any doctrine that was thought to be the doctrine of the

the goſpel: abroad all Proteſtants were invited to a coalition with her, in order to ſtrengthen their common cauſe and common intereſt. An inundation of Reformers, in various ſhapes, ſoon deluged the whole land. One might ſay, that almoſt in every corner, ſome inviſible agent had been playing the pranks of Ovid's Metamorphoſes. Still the univerſities and the ſeveral orders of the clergy kept up the viſibility of the ancient Church. It was neceſſary to weaken, gradually, their foundations. The moſt backward in the road of conſcience, but moſt forward in the road of preferment, were found the fitteſt tools to be played off by the engines of ſtate. The refractory were firſt made very uneaſy in their ſituations, and after a courſe of ill uſage, were at laſt diſmiſſed as unprofitable ſervants: but all this was done by a ſort of ſo imperceptible a ſhadowing, that there was no obſerving the hand that directed the traces of the pencil.

It may be a juſt inference, from all the circumſtances hitherto related, that Elizabeth, in her ſtate of ſeparation from the Catholic Church, could glance with an indifferent eye at any mode of faith or religious worſhip, and

that, in this reſpect, ſhe had no particular favourite to fondle and gaze at in the true ſpirit of complacency. But policy ſuggeſted to her what ſhe owed to the crown ſhe wore, the ſcepter ſhe ſwayed, and the bulk of the people ſhe governed. Though men are prone to gape after novelties, and the people of England are particularly remarkable for their extreme curioſity; yet as it is very hard to diveſt the mind of old notions, nurtured by education, and made ſtrong by habit, ſhe choſe a form of Religion which made the leaſt deviation from that which ſhe found eſtabliſhed; and ſo that it might ſeem, not ſo much to exclude the old one intirely, as to dreſs it up in a new garb; not ſo much to eradicate the old tree, as to graft on it a new ſtock. The people did not miſs the pomp of the epiſcopal hierarchy, and moſt eccleſiaſtical functions were exerciſed according to the ceremonial of the former decorum. The doctrine and diſcipline of her brother Proteſtants at Geneva, were very little to her taſte; they claſhed with her Headſhip of the Proteſtant religion; they did not chime in with her imperial government and high notions of Prerogative; they recommended the equality of mankind againſt the deſpotiſm of monarchs:

monarchs: and in other points of view they appeared to her crude, jejune, ſteril; yet replete with illiberal notions of the goodneſs of God, and the duties of his creatures. But by granting an unlimited toleration to theſe her Proteſtant brethren, in the beginning of her reign, ſhe conjured up a ſpirit which ſhe was never afterwards able to lay. They were a perpetual thorn in her fleſh, and amidſt the pangs of anguiſh they gave her, ſhe was often heard to ſay, "That ſhe knew very well what "would content the Catholics, but did not "know what would content the Puritans." Her ſaying was deemed prophetic in the next century, when they overthrew both Church and State; but the miſchief had been brooding ever ſince the year 1571, in the 13th year of her reign, when the Church of England received its firſt conſiſtence by the publication of the XXXIX articles of its religion, and an injunction to ſubſcribe to them; as alſo to the Queen's Supremacy, and to the Book of Common Prayer.

The Catholics had been perſecuted for ſome time before this æra, but their religious worſhip was not ſuppreſſed, by law, till the 23d

Eliz. when, and in the ſubſequent reigns, as cauſes for new perſecutions of them were pretended, they were ſubjected to divers penalties, forfeitures, diſabilities, and inconveniencies, ſuch as no body of ſubjects were ever yet treated with in any ſtate. They muſt indeed, as judging from appearances, have a very bad opinion of Elizabeth's moral character, in falſifying her oath to defend and maintain the Catholic religion; and it is not to be queſtioned, if they had power to effect it, but they would have ſet up Mary Queen of Scots in her room, to be revenged of her perfidy. Elizabeth, therefore, on one ſide, and the Catholics on the other, muſt be conſidered as natural and implacable enemies to one another. She had ignominiouſly ejected them out of their *jus paternum*, the right of preſcription they had from their anceſtors, nay, from the firſt propagation of Chriſtianity in England, to be the eſtabliſhed Religion in the land; and if they had made attempts, during her reign, to recover that right, we cannot judge them to be ſo culpable on that account as they are commonly repreſented.

The

The Goſpel counſels us to love and to do good to our enemies; but ſelf-love, ſo inherent to human nature, will often kick againſt this divine precept, and hatred and revenge will lurk in the heart. Few were ſo conſpicuous for hatred as Elizabeth, and not only hatred, but a * long foſtered deadly revenge. Mary, Queen of Scots was the principal object of it; and though perhaps as innocent in ſuing at the court of Rome for the crown of England, as the Lady Jane Grey was in accepting it, at the perſuaſion of the Earl of Northumberland; yet for this crime, if it could be called a crime, when Elizabeth's legitimacy was diſputed by all the Chriſtian world, except the parliament of England, ſhe was perſecuted to death, and all her adherents; witneſs the Duke of Norfolk, for his private treaty of marriage with her. Open force is tolerable, but no excuſe can be given for occult malice, or malice maſked with the ſpecious gloſs of friendſhip. Elizabeth propoſed Leiceſter to her for a huſband, and can we think it was with any other view than to cut

* Odia in longum jaciens quæ reconderet, auctaque promeret. TAC.

cut ſhort her days by poiſon, when we reflect a little on the private character of ſo baſe a villain? Mary eſcaped this ſnare, but it was her unhappy lot to have a more intimate knowledge of Elizabeth's reſentment, when her promiſed place of refuge and hoſpitality was converted into a priſon, and ſhe at length did not find that mercy, which Elizabeth herſelf had found in her extremity.

But in cloſing this ſcene of horror, let us form ſome ſtrictures on it. Was Queen Elizabeth's revenging herſelf on Mary Queen of Scots, the reſult of Mary's forcing her, by the French intrigues at the court of Rome, to become a Proteſtant for preſerving her crown? Or was this revenge occaſioned by any ſubſequent offence Mary had given? Or did Elizabeth only politically put her to death, to prevent her re-eſtabliſhing the Catholic religion in England if ſhe was to ſurvive her? It appears from * hiſtory, that Mary, on her trial, had given ample juſtificative proofs of her innocence, as to any conſpiracy ſhe herſelf had been

* See Robertſon's Hiſtory of Scotland.

been engaged in to deprive Queen Elizabeth of her crown whilſt ſhe was in England. If ſo, no ſubſequent offence was the cauſe of this revenge: for it was not juſt that the reputed heireſs, by primogeniture, to the crown, ſhould ſuffer for the conſpiracy of others, though in her favour, if it was not proved that ſhe had abetted them in it. It is not probable that Elizabeth put her to death on the proſpect of her deſtroying the Proteſtant religion; for it is hard to deſtroy any religion when it has once taken root: and the Proteſtants, as a very ſtrong party, in caſe of her ſurviving Elizabeth, might be preſumed to bind her by conditions in their favour. Beſides, as Queen Elizabeth never did acknowledge a ſucceſſor, or even nominate one by will or before her death, it is plain this was not her motive. James I. Mary's ſon, was educated a Proteſtant, and if ſhe thought fit to own him as her heir, ſhe could procure his ſucceſſion by parliament, in excluſion to his mother. The ſtreſs of the affair will then lie on the firſt queſtion. Elizabeth hated the mother, and hated the ſon on the mother's account. Neither would have ſucceeded her, if ſhe was able to prevent it. But it is odd, if not abſurd to think,

think, that her revenge on Mary, Queen of Scots, was merely for forcing her to become a Proteſtant. It is ſo; and the way of making herſelf an attonement for ſo doing, is likewiſe very unchriſtian and ſtrange, to the laſt degree. But it ſeems to border very nearly on truth, and there have been inſtances of revenge of a like nature. Elizabeth, that founder and ſupreme Head of the Church of England under Chriſt; that perſecutrix of the Catholics; that deſtroyer of their religious worſhip, by penal laws, was therefore only a Proteſtant in outward appearance. Her excommunication is ſuppoſed to be taken off by the Pope, and his abſolution and apoſtolical benediction given her, at the time of her connexions with him to defeat the deſigns of the King of Spain. Sixtus, in applauding all her meaſures, rejoiced that it was the glory of his Pontificate to have cut off the head of the Count de Pepoli: but none of his cotemporaries were, in his opinion, comparable to Elizabeth in greatneſs * being able to ſtrike off a crowned head,

* O beata fœmina che ai guſtato el piacer di far ſaltare una teſta coronata. D'Aubigne Hist. Univer.

head, and for this only he envied her felicity. As proofs of Elizabeth's believing the two chief conteſted points of the Catholic religion, viz. the Pope's Supremacy and the Real Preſence, we find that ſhe confeſſed to the Sieur de Lanſac, that ſhe was perſuaded of the truth of the † firſt; and to the Spaniſh ambaſſador of the ‡ ſecond. She is ſaid alſo to have made void the works of her own hands, and diſowned the fruits of her apoſtolical miſſion, as Head of the Church, viz. her own § Biſhops, by driving them away when they came to ſee her in her laſt illneſs, and ſtiling them Mock-biſhops, and Hedge-preſbyters.

I am

---

† Perſon. in Reſp. ad Coquum, cap. 15. p. 363, 364, apud Henricum Fitz-Simon in Britannomachia Miniſtrorum, lib. 31. cap. 5. pag. 318.

‡ Comiti (poſtea Duci Feriæ) realem Chriſti præſentiam eſſe juravit: quod ejuſdem Ducis teſtantur ad Regem Literæ (Novembr. 16, anni 1558) in Archivis Cymancæ in Hiſpania conſervatæ. Id. Ibid.

§ Denique averſionem ejus a tota reformatione & grege Miniſtrorum, horror quem erga Pſeudo-Epiſcopos in ſupremo morbo ad ſe accidentes præ ſe tulit, adeo eos Preſbyteros de Sepibus (phraſis ea eſt Anglorum erga mendicos & meretrices, victu tectoque carentes) vocatos ab aſpectu ſuo facere juſſerit, luculenter demonſtrat. Id. Fitz-Simon, ibid. He quotes Diſcuſſ. Perſonii, cap. 2. from page 216 to 220.

I am well aware, that, to ſoften theſe charges, it will be ſaid, that the authors of them were Catholics, and conſequently to be ſuſpected of ſincerity; and that Parſons eſpeally, as a Jeſuit, would contrive any thing for the ſupport of his cauſe. Be it ſo; yet Parſons was an author of credit, and he might have come at a ſecret by means a Proteſtant could not. But Queen Elizabeth's belief of the Popes's Supremacy and the Real Preſence, is founded on other authorities: and the belief of the latter, a Proteſtant may argue, was common to her with other Proteſtants, the Lutherans. As to the ſurmiſe of her being abſolved by the Pope, no anecdote or hiſtory, public or ſecret, that we know of, authenticate that ſuch a thing happened; and her diſcarding her Biſhops in ſo ſcandalous a manner, may perhaps deſerve farther confirmation, and a more unexceptionable authority.

However, from all that has been ſaid, we cannot help thinking, that in affairs of religion ſhe was not quite ſincere on either ſide; and that ſhe had been playing, during her whole reign, a downright politico-religious farce; and this, ſometimes in conjunction with the Pope, and

and ſometimes as her own fancy led her, with others. Remorſe for having acted ſo treacherous a part, might be the cauſe of that deep melancholy, and mortal grief, of which ſhe died. She might have regretted the loſs of the Earl of Eſſex, but not through love, ſhe was then an old woman. She felt no diminution of authority; it continued uncontrouled with her to the laſt. Something therefore muſt at laſt have ſtared her in the face, to weigh her down under ſo fixt a depreſſion of ſpirits. O Conſcience! thou accuſer and judge of guilt, how ſharp muſt be thy pangs, when thou openeſt to our aſtoniſhed eyes, the ſight of the tribunal of the Great God, with whom there is no exception of perſons, and before whom all worldly craft vaniſheth away as fleeting and as empty as a ſhadow!

## CHAP. V.

*Conſiderations on the Penal Laws, enacted by the Parliament of England againſt Catholics.*

IT is evident, from the ſeveral matters diſcuſſed and proved in the foregoing chapter, that

that the eſtabliſhment of the Reformed Doctrines in England, and of the Church of England, framed, for the moſt part, out of theſe Reformed Doctrines, is very little otherwiſe owing than to the determinate act of the will for gratifying luſt on the ſide of King Henry VIII. and to the deſire of preſerving a crown, on the ſide of Queen Elizabeth. It is alſo evident, that the perſecutions the Catholics drew upon themſelves from theſe two princes, were for no other reaſon than their not countenancing, in Henry, what was unlawful according to the precept of the Goſpel; and their being a little troubleſome to Elizabeth, becauſe ſhe had broke her faith to them, and deſerted their religion. It is, therefore, plain, who were the proper delinquents; who acted according to conſcience, and who againſt it. Surely princes do not ſtand excuſable for a manifeſt violation of the law of God. They will be judged by the Goſpel as well as the meaneſt of their ſubjects; and if no ſalutary reſtraint was to be laid on them by the ſubject; if no laws were to be obſerved by them for the goverment of themſelves as well as of others; if no expoſtulation for the wrongs they have done was to be admitted; all the world, long

ſince,

ſince, would have been ſtruck dumb under the menaces and oppreſſion of Deſpotiſm. The Catholics, in ſlightly reſiſting thoſe two princes, did nothing more than their duty, in virtue of ſacred laws and ſacred contracts; but if their remonſtrances were vain, and they found themſelves reduced to the neceſſity of ſubmitting to the law of the ſtronger, that's no argument their cauſe was bad, or that they had no right to complain. They were not intruders upon any eſtabliſhed religion before them; others were the intruders upon their eſtabliſhment; and becoming more potent and formidable by the favour of the prince, like bold invaders, they laid forcible hands on their right, reſolved to maintain poſſeſſion.

This reſolution of maintaining poſſeſſion, laid the ground-work of all the Penal Laws that were afterwards contrived againſt the Catholics. The Eagle was caught in the net of ſtate machinations, and it was ever after adviſable to keep her wings clipped, and claws cut; for thus diſabled, it was impoſſible ſhe ſhould ever again attempt to ſoar. Let it not be imagined, that the notion of ſerving God better as a Proteſtant than as a Catholic, ever entered

entered Queen Elizabeth's heart. No; the Religion ſhe eſtabliſhed was all a ſtate trick; and if her ſucceſſors thought it good, they did ſo, more perhaps from prejudice of education, than by examining into its merit. The Stuart family were often urged by the clamours of artful diſturbers of the peace, to put Queen Elizabeth's Penal Laws in execution againſt the Catholics; they were even ſometimes puſhed on themſelves to give their ſanction to other laws, not leſs ſevere, for further annoying them and diſcrediting their religious worſhip; yet none of this family were ever known to ſpeak diſreſpectfully of them. James I. tho' tutored in the ſchool of Calvin, had no mean opinion of the doctrinal tenets and morality of the Catholics. His Queen, Anne of Denmark, is ſaid to be reconciled to the Catholic Church before ſhe died. Charles I. was ſo well pleaſed with his Catholic ſubjects, that he was himſelf ſuſpected of being of their religion. Cromwell treated them with great lenity and indulgence. Charles II.'s eaſy temper yielded to his ſigning ſome acts of parliament, greatly to their prejudice. The Catholic peers were not excluded ſitting in parliament till towards the latter end of his reign,

and

and many Catholic gentlemen ſerved in the Houſe of Commons. All the bitter perſecutions in this reign againſt the Catholics, aimed indirectly at the Royal Family, were propagated by the ſhoots of the former rebellion, ſtill ſubſiſting in the calumny of Oates's plot, and the rancour diſplayed in the excluſion bill againſt the Duke of York. Yet the King was ſenſible that the Catholics were his beſt and moſt cordial friends; and God's providential care, ſo ſignal for protecting him in many occurrences of his life, did, notwithſtanding his irregularities, accompany him to the end. By his mercy he repented, and died in the boſom of the Catholic Church. King William's partizans ſtimulated him to many acts of violence againſt the Catholics; but they were all merely political, calculated, as in Queen Elizabeth's reign, to ſecure the crown upon his head, and for their own preſervation, as it was not very probable any terms would be granted them if James II. happened to be reſtored. The other meaſures, ſince concerted and entered into againſt the Catholics, all lean upon the baſis of the Revolution, not with any direct hatred to the Catholic religion as ſuch, but ſo far as it ſeems

to

to threaten the ſtability of the Proteſtant ſucceſſion.

But how long muſt all thoſe political preſervatives, theſe reaſons of State, this intereſt of the reigning Prince, hold the ſword of Perſecution unſheathed, and hanging over the necks of diſtreſſed Catholics? No Proteſtant can or will ſay that they are perſecuted, as the Jews of old perſecuted, on the ſuppoſition of doing God ſervice. One ſhould think, not ſo much conſidering things with the penetration of a philoſophic eye, as upon a very curſory inſpection, that the body politic, and the Church conjoined with that body politic, are in a crazy condition, when they cannot recommend themſelves without the neceſſity of ſuch ſupporters as penal laws. We can never apply to them theſe words of the ſcripture, *How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Goſpel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!* Iſa. lii. 7. and Rom. x. 15. Here is no Goſpel of peace preached, no glad tidings of good things brought; but, inſtead thereof, the penal laws againſt Catholics abound with treaſons and unaccountable felonies; they hang, draw, and quarter; they bridewell, impriſon, baniſh, and

ſell

ſell people into ſlavery; lands, goods, common right, and all the natural privileges of free-born Engliſhmen, are forfeited by them: people are often convicted in an arbitrary way, and one man is puniſhed for the act of another; the poor diſtreſſed widow and the helpleſs orphan do not eſcape their fury: and all this, not for any diſloyalty, conſpiracy, or diſturbing the public peace; not for injuring our neighbour or fellow-ſubjects; for nothing criminal by any law, moral or divine; but only for worſhipping God according to the light he has given us, in the beſt manner we can, and which after a ſerious inquiry, and upon conviction of conſcience, we apprehend to be acceptable to him.

There is no alternative for a Catholic in his option, in conſequence of a rigorous execution of the penal laws, as he muſt either tamely ſubmit to be deſtroyed and ruined in this world, in order to ſave his ſoul in the next; or if he complies with the injunctions of the teſts propoſed to him, he muſt, as his conſcience tells him, think of being damned for preferring a temporal to his eternal welfare. Here on either ſide he is encompaſſed with horrors;

rors; and by the frailty of human nature he oftener condeſcends to ſympathiſe with the ſmiles of worldly felicity and ſecurity, than by his integrity to brave the ſtorm, and ſtand up firm againſt its frowns: or, if he is ſhaken, and has not ſtill fortitude enough to maintain the ſtruggle, and reſiſt with all his might, he flatters himſelf, like the Iriſh gentleman, that an act he was forced to for ſelf-preſervation, will not be imputed to him by God, and that he may ſtill find mercy notwithſtanding the apoſtacy of his mouth, as his heart had no ſhare in it. This Iriſh gentleman was a Catholic, and beſides a paternal eſtate which he enjoyed, was alſo next heir to a very plentiful fortune, coming to him from his uncle. According to a very iniquitous law enacted in Ireland, and ſtill in force there in regard to Proteſtant Diſcoveries, as it is called, any relation of the next heir may become a Proteſtant and exclude him, if in a year and a day after, this heir does not think fit himſelf to become a Proteſtant in his own defence, and ſo ſave his eſtate. The uncle died, and not one, but many relations of the heir, read their recantations almoſt at the ſame time, in hopes of the ſucceſſion, each for himſelf, and preſuming the heir was ſo te-

nacious

nacious of his religious principles, that no conſideration could prevail upon him to alter them. The heir's year and a day expired, he recants himſelf, and frankly tells the parſon, and all preſent in the church, his reaſon for ſo doing, "That he had rather truſt God with "his ſoul, than any raſcal with his eſtate." We ſee, from this example, what laudable converſions the Church of England makes; very few or none at all for conſcience ſake: this or that noble lord, this or that ſquire, turned to ſave his eſtate, or obtain one he had a right to, which he could not if he continued a Catholic. This or that Romiſh prieſt turned to get a wife; for as King Charles II. uſed to ſay on ſuch converſions, "We have got a bro-"ther, and ſurely we ſhall ſoon have a ſiſter." Yet they have all, according to the decency of announcing ſuch matters of importance in the public papers, renounced the errors of the Church of Rome; and the Church of England muſt certainly be a good and gracious Church for opening the aſylum of her faith and doctrines to ſuch proſelytes, though, at the ſame time, they do not believe one ſyllable of them.

But in regard to the Popery Laws in Ireland, which I have juſt now hinted at, in a cauſe that was tried by appeal from thence to the Britiſh Houſe of Lords, in the laſt ſeſſion of parliament, our preſent Head and Rock of the Law, its great ornament and luſtre, the friend to truth, and the deſpiſer of all the baſe artifices of injuſtice, was pleaſed to ſay on this occaſion, "That the Popery Laws in Ireland, "and the conſtruction there put upon them, "are a heap of monſtrous abſurdities and vile "oppreſſion; that they are ſubverſive of the "moral duties between man and man, and "conſequently of natural juſtice; and that "they break in upon the law of conſcience, "and encourage hypocriſy and a prophanation "of whatever is held moſt ſacred in religion." Others, Heads of the law, not leſs reſpectable for their erudition, and for their great abilities and integrity in their profeſſion, concurred with him in opinion. But are the Popery Laws in England more rational than thoſe of Ireland; I fear their comparative excellence is much upon a par, though the ſcale is oftener made to weigh down in Ireland than in England. What can be ſaid in favour of the many teſts and oaths, which muſt be taken for qualifi-

qualifications in Church and State? What can be more impious than to prophane the Holy Sacrament, by expoſing it to ſo many indignities for the purpoſes of ſecular ends and deſigns? Proteſtants that believe the Real Preſence, and how many are there that do? cannot, in conſcience, take the teſt concerning Tranſubſtantiation, or that the Sacrifice of the Maſs is idolatrous. This is an oath that no ſet of men, in their wits, could frame; or they muſt be ſuppoſed immediately inſpired, to be ſuch competent and accurate judges of Scripture, contrary to the belief and practice of the Church of Chriſt in all ages. Alas! into what * devious paths will not the heart of man rove; in what inextricable labyrinths will he not puzzle himſelf, when he is intent on eſtabliſhing a ſyſtem of abſurdities! If he did but conſider the pernicious tendency of all ſuch teſts and penal laws, morality being rather degraded than improved by them, he would be readily convinced, that it is calling God's wiſdom or power in queſtion, by not foreſeeing how, or being diffident of, or unable to, ſe-

 cure

* O tortuoſe ſerpens qui per mille mæandros, flexuoſaſque fraudes, agitas quieta corda! VET. COM.

cure his religion and worſhip, without having recourſe to ſuch ignominious helps.

By conſulting the foregoing chapter, or the hiſtory of our Kings, from the Reformation down to the preſent time, it may be ſeen what provocations, exigencies, and reaſons of State there were for enacting theſe penal laws, and enforcing theſe teſts; but if the ſame provocations, exigencies, and reaſons of State do not now ſubſiſt, and perhaps may never more ſubſiſt, there is no juſt reaſon for their being continued. I will readily grant, that when Proteſtants act according to their avowed principles of moderation, they in fact, and from their heart, renounce all perſecution; and the indulgence they ſhew to others, they hope to find themſelves. But it ſeems they have acted in the Church of England contrary to theſe principles; they have loſt ſight of them, and have ſurpaſſed the Mahommedans, whoſe religion was propagated by the ſword, in advancing a number of ſanguinary, ruinating laws. 'Tis true, I ſay again, that an Engliſhman, as a Proteſtant, diſclaims them; and as peculiarly remarkable for good nature, beyond the genius and diſpoſition of other people of the

globe,

globe, he abhors them. How then can he ſtand out for keeping them ſtill in force? He muſt know that theſe penal laws are intrinſically unjuſt, and repugnant to the divine law and natural equity. By his rule of faith, the word of God, as he underſtands it, he cannot help thinking, that he who believes according to the evidence of his own reaſon, is neceſſitated to that belief, and that to compel him againſt it, would be to compel him to renounce the moſt eſſential part of man, his Reaſon. For force here is perſecution, and conſequently not juſt; and perſecution for conſcience ſake, or to be driven from the evidence of conſcience by penalties and teſts, is an unwarrantable tyranny.

It will not be amiſs to conſider too the ſtate of the Catholic Peers in England; all of them of the prime and flower of the Nobility of the land, of titles and creations of long ſtanding, and formerly diſtinguiſhed for their eminent ſervices to the crown and kingdom. Now how forlorn do they appear! How diſtreſſed their ſituation, from the penal and other laws! What does it now avail them to be born hereditary members of the King's Great Council?

They are deprived of this juſt right; and if this was not enough, they are harraſſed in their property, and a mark of a ſort of infamy is ſet upon them, by a double tax. Many other Nobles, of an inferior rank, of the ſame religious profeſſion, with gentlemen, in whoſe veins ſtill runs ſome of the beſt Engliſh blood, groan under the ſeverities of the like Egyptian bondage. What ſhall I ſay of the ſhattered remains of the Iriſh Catholic Nobility? Their eſtates and fortunes were delivered over to plunder, and now the offspring of perhaps a common ſoldier, or ſubaltern in Cromwell's or King William's army, glories in the enjoyment of them, and bleſſes the happy times and laws that were able to keep them in poſſeſſion. You have, fellow-countrymen! all you can deſire, unleſs you have a mind ſtill to purſue the blow, and perſecute us to death. You have debarred us of worſhipping God in our way; you have ſtript us of our fortunes; little elſe remains for the exerciſe of your indignation, but our lives. Take then theſe abject lives away; it is better they ſhould be forfeited, and the ſpirit return pure and undefiled to God, from whom it came, than be polluted by the abomination of blaſphemous teſts.

teſts. You now again ſeem to threaten us with thoſe teſts, for how otherwiſe can we conſtrue the late enquiries into our number, our ages, and our profeſſions? If the intention was benevolent, there was no manner of neceſſity for ſuch enquiry, which in the main is fruitleſs as to any exactneſs in the number, though it may ſerve, by tendering the oaths to ſuch as are known, and could not eſcape the enquiry, to proceed againſt them on any emergency, and all at once, as Popiſh Recuſants.

But be the matter as it may, we muſt reſt in expectation of the event, as time will ſhew all things in their native colours. Yet we hope that the nation is not deſtitute of ſober, thinking, humane and upright men, who will not be aſhamed to plead our cauſe. The ſtate is under no neceſſity of putting the Catholics upon the footing of other ſubjects; neither do the Catholics ſeem to require it. But the Catholics may be good ſubjects, if the ſtate would permit them; and in order to their being made good ſubjects, it would be found policy to withdraw the penal laws, and grant them a toleration of their religious worſhip, with a few other immunities and privileges. Theſe parti-

mulars I shall endeavour to illustrate in the next chapters.

## CHAP. VI.

### *Of the expediency of making the Catholics good Subjects.*

IT may be a maxim in politics, that it is impossible to destroy a religion when it has once firmly rooted itself, and has prevailed in time and place. I do not here speak of impious sects, which Providence may have permitted for proving the Faithful; they vanished away in their own conceits, and little more than the name of them now remains. But I here speak of a religion conformable to the word of God, and which teaches and practises a true and unexceptionable morality. Such is the Catholic religion; it has been preached in all parts of the earth; in all parts it has had its votaries; and to this day you will find it in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, professed and taught with little or no molestation from Mohammedans and Pagans. It was the primitive

mitive Chriſtian religion in England, Scotland, and Ireland; and though the cauſes before recited had endeavoured to extirpate it; though penal laws and teſts, "in ſmiting the ſhepherd had diſperſed the ſheep of the flock," and made them inſenſibly fall off from the faith; and though numbers of its members, intimidated by the ſame penal laws, to ſave their fortunes and for other worldly conſiderations, had conſented to temporize; yet it has ſtill retained thouſands in the Britiſh dominions, and will, by God's help, wax ſtronger and more in number, to the end of the world.

On a ſuppoſition, therefore, of an impoſſibility of deſtroying the Catholic religion in the Britiſh empire, it would be prudent in a ſtate, and in the prince that governs that ſtate, to have no internal enemies that may annoy them in times of danger. If you will not ſeek, nor accept of a reconciliation with one you have made your enemy, how can it be expected, that he can have your intereſt and welfare at heart? 'Tis true, the number and power of Engliſh, Scots, and Iriſh Catholics, are ſo trifling, compared with the Proteſtant ſtrength, that they may be treated with the contempt

David expreſſes of his own inſignificancy to Saul; *After whom is the King of Iſrael come out? After whom doſt thou purſue? After a dead dog, after a flea.* 1 Sam. xxiv. 14. Yes, the appellation of *dead dogs* and *fleas* may well ſuit them. They have no longer any * force left to think of making oppoſition; neither are their minds ſo haughty as to preſume they are of any account: they might be reduced to a worſe condition than their preſent, if ſentiments of humanity did not plead pity for them, and if the laws that oppreſs them did not afford them ſome ſhelter. However, the advice is always good, and may be ſupported from ſeveral teſtimonies of hiſtory, that no enemy whatever ought to be held in a contemptible light, as ſome time or other he may find an opportunity to retaliate and obey the dictates of revenge. The Britiſh and Iriſh Catholics, tho' helpleſs in themſelves, claim a fraternity with many other very reſpectable bodies of men throughout Europe, who doubtleſs would reſent their further ill treatment, and, on the contrary, would be friends to England, and would

* Non ea vis animo, nec tanta ſuperbia victis. VIRG.

would rejoice to ſee them ſerve their God with more freedom, and diſincumbered of the preſſure of penal laws. What ſhould retard this ſalutary work? The Catholics are willing to forgive and forget all paſt injuries; they are diſpoſed to be good and faithful ſubjects; and they are ready to give a warrant of their fidelity and obedience to the government.

The only objection to their receiving any terms of accomodation from the Britiſh legiſlative powers, lies in two capital points: firſt, that they are attached to the baniſhed Stuart family: ſecondly, that they acknowledge a power in the Pope, which is inconſiſtent with the laws of this realm. The Pope's power, as acknowledged by Catholics, I ſhall ſhew in the next chapter, to be purely ſpiritual, and to regard only matters of religion.

As to the firſt and moſt material point, the Britiſh and Iriſh Catholics have long been diſuſed to conſider with High-churchmen, as things not to be conteſted, the notions of hereditary and inalienable right, divine right, paſſive obedience, and non-reſiſtance. Theſe doctrines, they know, have been all exploded

by

by the Revolution; and the Parliament then resuming a power, which they had before exercised, to dispose of the crown, it has ever since been properly elective, and no regard has been paid to direct hereditary right, nor to inalienable right, nor to divine right; the last being the consequence of succession by hereditary and inalienable right; because, *ipso facto*, that a people chuse a King, he is responsible to them for the observance of the contract he has entered into with them in order to be elected, and therefore cannot plead that his right, in virtue of hereditary succession, immediately and directly flows from God, and that to Him only he is accountable for his actions. It is certain that the parliament has this power, and it was never invalidated by any fair argument to the contrary, though many of our Kings have affected to reign by an hereditary and inalienable, and consequently a divine right; and though also their subjects had flattered them with such exalted ideas of a pre-eminence, not to be resisted, much less to admit of any misconstruction in the nature of its tenure. I have already mentioned, that this power of the parliament, was so far from being questioned by Sir Thomas Moore,

and

and Fiſher, biſhop of Rocheſter, both martyrs to the Catholic cauſe, that they readily acquieſced in acknowledging it; and were likewiſe of opinion, that the ſubjects are obliged to comply, in conſcience, with whatever the parliament ſhould regulate, in conſequence of this power.

Now, if even the law of conſcience cannot think itſelf juſtifiable before God, in ſuperſeding, by only a tacit averſion, without any ouvert malice, ſuch law or act of civil power, it muſt therefore deem this power to be good and ſubſtantial, lawful and valid; a power requiring ſubmiſſion and obedience, and binding to all intents and purpoſes whatſoever. Hereditary and inalienable right being therefore ſet aſide by this power of parliament, the ſucceſſion was made elective by the ſame power of parliament; and to avoid the tumults and diſſenſions, the ſeditions and wars that often happen, as in Poland and Germany, from the contention and jarring intereſts of candidates for the crown, it wiſely had a regard to the next heir, yet thought proper to ſtile him, till the inſtant of his actual ſucceſſion, *preſumptive*, to cut ſhort his hopes of being the *real* and *undoubted*

*doubted* heir, leſt any thing ſhould occur which might oblige the parliament to have recourſe to their power, and alter the ſucceſſion.

This diſtinction, therefore, between *hereditary right* and *elective right*, the latter derived from a power inherent to the parliament, the former the reſult of immediate heirſhip to the laſt poſſeſſor, clears up the whole myſtery that had ſo long embarraſſed the ideas of Catholics, Non-jurors, and the major part of the people of Scotland, though Preſbyterians. They imagined the right of the crown in King William, Queen Mary, and Queen Anne, to be very equivocal, and could not conceive, on the acceſſion of the houſe of Hanover, why ſuch a wide breach ſhould be made in the direct ſucceſſion, as to place the crown on the head of a remote relation to the houſe of Stuart. But it was the will of the parliament to provide a Proteſtant heir, and it was in their power to make choice of him for their King. There can be no *plus ultra* in the argument, and all indiſcriminately, throughout the Britiſh dominions, are indiſpenſibly obliged in conſcience to be obedient to this will, authority, and power of parliament.

As then, according to this eſtabliſhmen by parliament, His moſt Sacred Majeſty, King George the Third, is our lawful and rightful King and Sovereign, all the Catholics in his dominions are ready and willing, I make no doubt, to take an oath of allegiance to him, and that oath, *bona fide*, in the ſincerity of their hearts, and with a ſafe conſcience, in manner following:

I, A. B. *an unworthy member of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apoſtolic, Roman Church; in the preſence of the moſt Holy and Undivided* TRINITY, *bleſſed for evermore; do ſwear, that I hold His moſt Sacred Majeſty,* GEORGE III. *King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, to be my rightful King and lawful Sovereign, as by Law eſtabliſhed; that I will obey and demean myſelf in all reſpects to him as a good ſubject, neither meditating myſelf, nor engaging in any* Treaſon, Rebellion, *or*, War; *nor aiding, abetting, or encouraging others in any* Treaſon, Rebellion, *or* War, *againſt Him; and that I will truly and faithfully obſerve the ſame loyalty, and pay the ſame obedience to* HIM *whom the Parliament ſhall appoint for His ſucceſſor.*

So help me God.

If

If his Majeſty and Parliament are pleaſed to accept this oath of allegiance from the Catholics, it is to be hoped all former animoſities will ſubſide againſt them, and that there will be perfect union in mutual amity and benevolence among all parties, to promote the public good, and ſupport his Majeſty's government in honour and dignity.

It is an eaſy matter to content the Catholics, and this Queen Elizabeth knew, though ſhe would not do it for private reaſons of ſtate. Allow them a toleration of their religious worſhip; ſecure to them their property in a more equitable and explicit manner than the precarious ſtate it now hangs in; let them have the privilege of educating their own youth, in ſchools and ſeminaries of learning ſuperintended by themſelves; and you will ſurely bind them to you by the ſtricteſt ties of friendſhip and gratitude. Some, no doubt, will murmur at the firſt and laſt conceſſions. What, a toleration of Popery and Slavery, which we have been endeavouring ſince the Reformation to aboliſh, and to this ſuperadded a privilege for educating their youth! To the firſt I anſwer, that it can cauſe no detriment to a ſtate,

where

where there is a neceſſity, for the internal repoſe of the ſtate and the common good and benefit of tolerating a multiplicity of religions, to tolerate any one particular worſhip, provided there is nothing in that worſhip which can corrupt the morals of the people, and encourage them to be bad ſubjects, by deſpiſing or otherwiſe injuring the government. The Catholic religion teaches the morality of the Goſpel, in its greateſt purity and ſtrictneſs; and if its members were to obſerve and abide by the inſtructions given them, no manner of wickedneſs, either in intention, or action, could be found amongſt them. But man is frail, concupiſence reigns in him, and he will ſometimes prevaricate; and that every Proteſtant knows. If therefore no fault can be found with the morality taught by the Catholic religion, much leſs can fault be found with the form of its worſhip, which is quite harmleſs and innocent, and cannot in any ſhape hurt the welfare of the ſtate. The Dutch, in their republic, though adopting Calviniſm as their eſtabliſhed Religion, tolerate the free exercise of all other religions. This they found themſelves neceſſitated to do for the good of the ſtate; and no inconveniency to it,

nor

nor diminution in its proſperity, has ever appeared from this toleration. The King of Pruſſia, acting upon a like principle of benefit to the ſeveral countries he is poſſeſſed of, allows the free exerciſe of all religions, and his Catholic ſubjects are ſaid to exceed in number his Proteſtant; they are employed under him in all capacities, and are loyal and faithful to him upon motives both of honour and duty. The ſame may be ſaid of other electorates and principalities in Germany, where Catholics and Proteſtants live intermixed, and in great harmony with one another; and even in ſome parts make, alternately, uſe of the ſame church for divine ſervice. The emperor Trajan *, writing to Pliny, orders him not to perſecute the Chriſtians in any wiſe, unleſs he has ſufficient proof of their attempting any thing to the prejudice of the Government. Hence we ſee, that there was a diſtinction made by this good and brave Emperor between the commonwealth and religion. The Jews themſelves accuſed our Saviour before Pilate, not for any treſpaſs againſt their religion, but for

* Lib. 10. Epiſt. 97 & 98.

for treaſon, becauſe he called himſelf King of the Jews, and ſtirred up the people. Judea was then ſubject to the Romans, and it was a crime of high treaſon to affect a kingſhip over a people that were a province of the Roman empire. It is therefore evident, that it is not any religion merely, which is criminal in a ſtate, but rather any treaſon or rebellion that may be ſet on foot, hy the profeſſors of that religion, to annoy or ſubvert thc government.

Therefore alſo, the toleration of the Catholic religion in England, and in other parts of the Britiſh empire, can be no manner of prejudice to the ſtate, in conſequence of their firm allegiance to the crown and government. Neither is there any fear of the introduction of Slavery with Popery; for the Catholics love to be as free, in point of civil liberty, as any people on the globe. It is only by accident, and not by choice, that they have fallen under the juriſdiction of arbitrary princes in different parts of Europe. Wherever they could, they have formed themſelves into republics; witneſs thoſe in Italy and Switzerland. If any ſlaviſh doctrines have ever been inculcated and preached up here, they were ſo by the Church

of

of England; and to that Church only muſt be attributed the doctrines of Paſſive Obedience, Non-reſiſtance, and the Divine Right of Kings; the Catholics had no hand in promoting them: on the contrary, they were the very people that obtained the Great Charters of our liberties, which the Proteſtants now ſo much glory in; they were the very people that fought up to their knees in blood, in the Barons wars, againſt the deſpotiſm of our monarchs, and did not ceaſe till they had founded our noble conſtitution, to reſtrain kingly power by a counterbalance in the ſupreme national council, ſtiled the Parliament. Had it not been for their ſtruggles, a parliament might never have exiſted in England for the good of the Proteſtants. Go now, and accuſe the Catholics of Slavery!

If a toleration of their religious worſhip is granted them, it is natural to think, that the education of their youth by themſelves ſhould accompany it. This too may be a national benefit, and perhaps of ſome importance. Conſider, for a moment, what ſums of money annually go out of Great Britain and Ireland for the education of the youth of both ſexes abroad; and not only for the article of education, but

for

far the ſupport of colleges, ſeminaries, and convents. All the money ſo expended, by allowing home education to Catholics, would circulate among ourſelves, and be a ſaving to the nation; and the colleges and ſeminaries would decay of courſe, when no longer ſupplied with pupils. Beſides, the youth in thoſe colleges and ſeminaries are taught not to think well of the government of their mother country, but to eſpouſe and cheriſh the intereſt of that they are educated in. Such prejudice of education has accompanied ſome very worthy and honeſt men to their graves, and it can only be prevented by indulging the Catholics in the liberty of having their children brought up at home, in ſchools and ſeminaries conducted by themſelves.

There is ſtill another objection which deſerves examination. It may be alledged, that if a toleration was granted to Catholics, it would be a means to ſpirit up their clergy to make converts; whereas, as things now ſtand, being over-awed by penal laws, they are afraid to engage in ſuch purſuits. I verily believe, that more converſions are made by Catholics under perſecution, than there would be if they

were

were exempted from that apprehenſion, Suffered to live unperſecuted, they would be more moderate in attempts of the kind; they would be careful not to give any umbrage to the government: but perſecuted, they muſt naturally be ſuppoſed to exert themſelves in ſtrengthening their party, in collecting force from the rigour of oppoſition, and in * manning their hearts with fortitude, notwithſtanding the proſpect of puniſhment. Some perſons, without any perſuaſion of a clergyman, or others, from their own reflections, "trying all things, "and ſeeking after that which is beſt," become Catholics, and there is no law in the world that can deter them from executing what they have ſo purpoſed. Another cauſe of converſion to the Catholic religion, may be the ſupineneſs and indolent diſpoſition of the eſtabliſhed clergy, to inſtruct their flock and keep them to their duty. The Methodiſts, and and other fanatics, on one ſide, and Deiſts and other infidels on the other, have made, within theſe few years, ſome large ſtrides to debilitate the foundations of the Church of England; and

* Ducit opes animumque ferro. Hor.

and if ever this Church was in danger, that danger does not ſeem to be now far off. The very cauſes of conſcience, that gave room here in England to the Reformation, and helped to overturn the Catholic religion, threaten the preſent eſtabliſhed Church with the like diſſolution. There ſeems to be no probable means for it to retrieve its honour, to revive the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, to emerge out of lax diſcipline, and to acquire reſpect, conſiſtency, and ſtability, than to ſeek a union with the Catholic Church. A project for uniting the Church of England with the Gallican Church, in the view of uniting all the Weſtern Churches, was concerted between Archbiſhop Wake and the Doctors of the Sorbonne, in the reign of King George I. But the projectors went the wrong way to work. The Schiſm would have been much wider, and they would have broke the unity of the Faith, a meaſure which, as I have before ſhewn, cannot be juſtified. They ſhould have referred the matter immediately to the See of Rome, and then, as the Church of England agrees in almoſt all the Fundamentals and Eſſentials of Faith with the Catholics, and as other points might be amicably adjuſted, by the parties coming

coming to a right underſtanding with each other, the negotiation would perhaps have proſpered. I have long thought of a ſcheme for effecting ſo ſalutary an union, and do purpoſe, ſome time or other, to make it public. The government and ſubjects of England, will be ſo ſecured, in independency, that no encroachment, in any reſpect, of the See of Rome on them can be apprehended from the union; and yet the See of Rome will have reaſon to be well pleaſed and contented.

## CHAP. VII.

*Containing a ſhort Illuſtration of ſome Points of Faith, wherein the Catholics differ from the Proteſtants; with Conſiderations on the Power of the Pope, ſhewing, that he neither can abſolve Subjects from, nor diſpenſe with, their Oath of Allegiance to their Prince.*

FEW Proteſtants take a view of the Catholic Church, her Faith and her Doctrines, in the amiable light they deſerve to be ſeen in. They are led aſide from ſuch a fair object of contemplation by their paſſions and prejudices,

prejudices, and theſe ſeem to be rooted and confirmed in them by the malice of miſrepreſentation. If our antagoniſts were found to deal candidly with us, diſputes would ſoon be at an end. Inſtead of this candour, we are groſsly ſlandered, and many things are imputed to us, which we abſolutely reject as falſe and groundleſs. To obviate the ill conſequences of ſuch calumny is the deſign of this chapter; and order might ſeem to require that it ſhould be prefixed to what has been hitherto ſaid, to diſpoſe minds to think well of us; but as truth has ſeldom recourſe to ſtratagems of any kind, it was judged more eligible to convince the underſtanding without ſhewing proofs of an hypotheſis, than by firſt demonſtrating it, to create a good opinion in favour of its neceſſary deductions.

We muſt fix the truth of the Jewiſh religion upon the authority of God, who has ſpoken. We muſt alſo fix the truth of the Chriſtian religion, deduced from the truth of the Jewiſh, upon the ſame authority. If the firſt is falſe, and had not the authority of God to eſtabliſh and ſupport it, the ſecond is likewiſe falſe, as leaning upon the ground-

work of the firſt. We have many and ſubſtantial reaſons to believe that the Jewiſh religion proceeded from the authority of God, therefore we have the ſame reaſon to believe that the Chriſtian religion has proceeded from the ſame authority. The authority of God who has ſpoken, is what we call Revelation, and as an inducement to believe whatever God has revealed to us, we conſider God as infinitely good, and infinitly true. God's infinite goodneſs extends to all his creatures by his general and univerſal laws; it neither intends nor does them harm. Man, the work alſo of his hands, and his delight as a rational being, feels, in a more particular manner, the influence of his gracious beneficence; it always wills and does him good; and though God has denied to him the knowledge of the ways of his providence, yet he cannot help confeſſing, that its diſpenſations are wiſe, juſt, and good. Therefore God's goodneſs cannot be queſtioned by man. Therefore whatever it directs man to do, and to obſerve for pleaſing him, muſt conduce to man's benefit. But God alſo is infinitely true, as a neceſſary conſequence of his infinite goodneſs. If his goodneſs cannot permit him to injure us, ſo

neither

neither can his truth permit him to deceive us. It is impoſſiable to conceive that what is infinitely good can be the cauſe of deception. Therefore God cannot lead us into error. Therefore whatever God has revealed to us is true. Therefore the Chriſtian religion, revealed to us by the authority of God in the ſcriptures, is true; and conſequently to pleaſe God, it demands peremptorily the belief of every man it has been preached to; and this from the authenticity of ſupernatural powers, ſigns, and wonders, atteſted by a number of men, who neither could be deceived themſelves, nor could be ſuppoſed to ſucceed in a combination to deceive others.

We here ſee that reaſon anticipates belief; for it is our reaſoning faculty that perſuades us to judge, that what we believe upon the authority of a good and true God, cannot be amiſs. Upon ſuch foundation we make a right uſe of our reaſon in matters of faith; but make an ill uſe of it when we controvert any point of Revelation, as then immediately we doubt of God's goodneſs, and call his veracity in queſtion; or elſe, by pride and preſumption we put ourſelves upon a level with God, daring to

correct his work. *But, if we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe, to the ſaving of the ſoul.* Heb. x. 39. We ſhall ſtrive to keep our reaſon ſubmiſſive, we ſhall enjoin it obedience to the will of God, knowing that by his authority, *faith is the ſubſtance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not ſeen.* Heb. xi. 1. If all the things propoſed to our belief were plain and obvious to the underſtanding, if they appeared to us in the light of mathematical, metaphyſical, or phyſical certainties, there would be then no faith, or no merit in our faith, becauſe we believe them to be ſo, not upon the authority of God, but the teſtimony of our ſenſes. There is therefore a neceſſity in Revelation to ſet aſide this teſtimony of the ſenſes. We muſt have recourſe only to our purely intellectual faculties under the guidance of reaſon; and yet this reaſon muſt not build merely on its own light; it muſt not ſeek after evidence in itſelf. All it has to do, is to collate circumſtances, to weigh them, to judge of their intrinſic value. This done; what is faith? *It is the evidence of things not ſeen.* Therefore there is an evidence in things not ſeen. But whence comes this evidence? Reaſon cannot find it in itſelf,

but

but finds it in the authority and will of God, and finds it an emanation from the treaſures of the divine wiſdom, and as a good and perfect gift deſcending from the father of lights. And now reaſon is ſilent! Now reaſon unreſervedly acquieſces! Now reaſon, with awe and reverence, reſts in the contemplation of ſo inſcrutable, yet excellent an object!

We have therefore the authority of God, who is infinitely good and true, as a guarantee for our faith in our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and for the truth of the Religion he eſtabliſhed, as the only acceptable to God. Here muſt we hold, and not ſuffer our poor and narrow conceptions to wander in reaſonings why God permitted the fall of the firſt man from his ſtate of innocence; why there was a neceſſity for an infinite ſatisfaction to repair the malice of the ſin of diſobedience in the firſt man, intailed upon his poſterity, ſuppoſing even that malice to be in its nature infinite; and why for the purpoſes of that reparation, the ſecond Perſon of the Bleſſed Trinity became incarnate in the womb of a Virgin, and died upon a croſs. Our thoughts muſt certainly be bewildered if we ſeek in ourſelves a

sufficient reason for these things; still these things are true; they are revealed to us by the word of God. We may likewise imagine, that the ignominious death of the Son of God upon a cross, was unworthy of God; but this death was predicted long before he took flesh, long before it happened. So that the true and humble Christian, who lives by faith, can only answer such difficulties by asking with St. Paul, *Who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him?* 1 Cor. ii. 16. If the proud Philosopher, or any other who abides by the suggestions of his own reason, preferably to all other considerations, scoffs at, and loads such belief with reproachful contempt, the humble Christian will again answer him with St. Paul; *The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.* Ib. 14.

It is this spiritual discernment that perceives the links of faith concatenated by the divine hand, when the carnal mind cannot know any thing of them. The just man, therefore, living by faith, discerns the end of the coming of Christ to be in a two-fold capacity: First,

as his Redeemer, by delivering him from the ſlavery of ſin, and making him, through himſelf, acceptable to God: Secondly, as his Teacher, by inſtructing him in ſpiritual life, and ſhewing him that its reward is not to be found here on earth, but in heaven. Hence, man's heart ſhould be raiſed to God in acts of perpetual praiſe and thankſgiving for benefits of ſo ſingular a nature. The firſt bleſſing requires his tacit adoration; the ſecond, his exultation and joy. In the firſt, Faith captivates his underſtanding, and commands him not to be curious to fathom its immenſity. In the ſecond, Faith indulges his intellectual powers with greater liberties, and he, by taking theſe liberties, expatiates over this boundleſs abyſs of divine love and goodneſs with exquiſite pleaſure, yet cannot help, at the ſame time to expreſs his aſtoniſhment at ſo infinite a condeſcenſion. He obſerves, how before the coming of the Saviour, the world was over-run with Polytheiſm and Idolatry; how all fleſh had corrupted its ways; how man followed the devices and deſires of his heart; how he prided himſelf in ſin; nay, authorized and juſtified himſelf in the commiſſion of it, from the example of his Gods; and how he thought

himſelf of ſome conſequence, put in competition with his Gods: but the Saviour had no ſooner declared and entered upon his miſſion, than the bright light of his doctrine began to diſſipate the clouds of man's underſtanding, clearing his fancy of vain deluſion, correcting his heart with principles of true virtue, and repleniſhing his ſoul with the knowledge of himſelf, and of the almighty, infinite, and perfect God that made him. This change in the corruption of human nature was not effected by the perſuaſive words of human wiſdom, but the teacher himſelf ſet the * example, and in his own perſon exhibited a pattern of the moſt conſummate virtues. The law of nature received its laſt perfection from him; and the moral obligations of the Moſaic Law were enforced by him with greater energy, and taught to flow by him in the true channel of the beauty of holineſs, by humility, ſelf-denial, love of one another, and love of our enemies. Nothing therefore could amend the perverſeneſs of human nature, nothing could recall it

* Longum iter per precepta, breve ac efficax per exempla. QUINT.

it to its primitive perfection in the designs of Providence, but the appearance of God in the flesh, "but the Word was made flesh and dwelt "among us," and "God * was that Word;" his almighty FIAT ordered "the light to be, "and there was light."

Now the WORD, or Son of God, co-eternal, and of the same substance with his Father, that great EMANUAL, or God with us; that Lord JESUS CHRIST, our Saviour and King anointed over us, having out of his infinite mercy condescended to repair our nature, by assuming it; to heal our infirmities, by taking them upon himself; to teach us the way in which we should walk, by his example: and to render us acceptable to his heavenly father, and gain us admittance to be partakers of his happiness, glory, and immortality, by the merits of his redemption: Now, that WORD, I say, having done all those wonderful things for us, it is reasonable to be convinced that our love, homage, and obedience to him should be in as perfect a degree as we are capable of. It was he that heretofore created the world;



* Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

" for without him nothing was made that was " made." It was he that delivered the Ten Commandments to the Children of Iſrael from Mount Sinai, telling them, that as he was their Lord and God, who had brought them out of the Land of Egypt, and out of the Houſe of Bondage, he had a right to impoſe Commandments on them. If then he had a right to impoſe Commandments on the Iſraelites and to give them a law for their obſervance, in virtue of having redeemed them from a corporal ſlavery; by a much ſtronger reaſon he had a right to impoſe commandments on us Chriſtians, and to give us a law for our obſervance, in virtue of his having redeemed us from the ſpiritual ſlavery of ſin. The pre-eminence of the Chriſtian Law above the Moſaic, is then in as great a degree as the immortal ſoul ſurpaſſes in excellence the mortal body. The Iſraelites had only temporal bleſſings promiſed them for the obſervance of the ceremonial and judicial law of Moſes; but Chriſtians have eternal bleſſings promiſed them for obſerving the ſpiritual and ſanctifying law of grace. The moral obligations of the law of Moſes being the perfection of the law of nature, and the rule of God's juſtice, merged into the law of Chriſt, and abide

abide in it for ever: But the ceremonial obligations of the ſame law being only temporal ſhadows, types, and figures of Chriſt, the expected Meſſiah, and of the means he was to eſtabliſh for ſanctification; they were to be abrogated at his coming, and at the promulging of his law; The ſhadow was to vaniſh before the ſubſtance; the type and figure was to yield to the reality.

It is evident from the premiſes, that Chriſt did eſtabliſh a law, and the moſt *perfect law*, which we find contained in the Goſpel; that he alſo eſtabliſhed certain means in this law for our ſanctification, which we call the *Sacraments*; that by the authority of this law, we are to believe in him and his doctrines, and to obſerve the moral obligations of theſe doctrines; that belief in him, and his doctrines, is what we call *Faith*, and that obſerving the moral obligations of his doctrines, is what we call *Good Works*; that faith and good works are both indiſpenſibly neceſſary to our ſalvation, as pleaſing to God, and marks of our duty and fidelity to him in his ſervice; that without a manifeſt riſque of our ſalvation, we cannot ſeparate faith from good works, nor good works from faith, becauſe faith muſt always operate through charity, and charity through faith; and

and becauſe Chriſt has ſaid: *Not every one, that ſaith unto me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doth the will of my father which is in heaven.* Matt. vii. 21. *Be ye therefore perfect, even as your father which is in heaven is perfect.* Matt. v. 48. That on the baſis of faith and charity, Chriſt has erected a ſpiritual Kingdom to himſelf, by which he reigns in our hearts, and with which he is well pleaſed, having ſanctified it by the merits of his redemption; that this ſpiritual kingdom is his Church, the members of which are all united under his government in the profeſſion of the ſame faith, the participation of the ſame ſacraments, and the communion of the ſame bond of charity; and that he has promiſed that this his church, or ſpiritual kingdom, ſhall not fail, but that the Holy Ghoſt ſhall guide it in all truth, to the conſummation of all things.

There ſhall not therefore be an end of Chriſt's kingdom, nor of his prieſthood; *The Lord hath ſworn, and will not repent; Thou art a Prieſt for ever, after the order of Melchiſedech.* Pſ. cx. 4. But, as it was neceſſary for Chriſt to ſuffer, and ſo enter into his glory, Luke xxiv. 26. and as Chriſt on that account, could not

reign

reign any otherwiſe over his Church militant, than inviſibly in the hearts of her ſaints and true and faithful members; he therefore delegated the care of adminiſtering and governing his ſpiritual kingdom here on earth to his apoſtles and their ſucceſſors after them. They are his viſible vice-gerents, they act by his authority committed to them, and they conduct all the purpoſes of his government according to the preſcript of the laws he has given them. Chriſt's own government of his ſpiritual kingdom, inviſible to us, as he ſits in heaven, on the right hand of his father, is truly monarchical and ſuffers no limitation; but his viſible government by vice-gerents, though alſo truly monarchical, ſuffers many limitations and reſtrictions. It is therefore a mixt monarchy, inſtituted in the order of the heavenly wiſdom, to prevent frail man's abuſing the exerciſe of the power entruſted to him. Chriſt choſe twelve Apoſtles, as the vice-gerents that were immediately to ſucceed him on earth in the government of his Church; but to one of theſe vice-gerents he gave a very particular charge beyond any of the reſt, of feeding his ſheep and lambs; he prayed that his faith might not fail, and he called him the rock on

which

which he would build his Church, and againſt which the gates of hell ſhould never prevail. Though all the Apoſtles, as conſtituted Chriſt's vice-gerents, may be ſuppoſed to be equal in power, having all the ſame commiſſion to preach his Goſpel, yet here for the purpoſes of unity, order, and regularity, a ſubordination was evidently eſtabliſhed amongſt them; they were to conſider Peter as their Head, and they were to conſider him as their chief Paſtor in commiſſion for feeding the flock of Chriſt. The words Head, Prince, King, and Shepherd of the People, were ſynonimous terms to ſignify the ſame thing among the Aſiatics of old; and ſo we find them in Homer, the moſt ancient profane writer that we know of. But Shepherd of the people was peculiarly characteriſtic of a good and excellent prince, who having the proſperity of his ſubjects at heart, ſtudies on all occaſions to be of ſervice to them, as the kind ſhepherd does to feed his flock in the beſt and faireſt paſtures. But it muſt not be imagined, that if St. Peter was appointed to be the Head of the Apoſtles, he had, in conſequence of his primacy, an abſolute and arbitrary power to controul, as he pleaſed, the wills and opinions of the reſt of the Apoſtles. No;

ſuch

such arbitrary power was incompatible with the government of Christ's kingdom of peace, unanimity, mildneſs, lenity, and humility. Peter's power extended no further than to convene his brethren upon any preſſing neceſſity, to conſult with them in common, to hear their advice, to ſubmit his own to debate, and when all matters had been duly deliberated upon and adjuſted, to execute their deciſions, or recommend them to be put in execution. St. Paul withſtood him to the face, and thought him to blame for paying too much deference to thoſe of the circumciſion; but St. Paul did not hereby diſpute his being the head of the Apoſtles; he calls him Cephas himſelf, and he only reproves him for being cautious in giving offence to the converted Jews by too free a communication with the Gentiles, *Gal.* ii.

Whoever duly reflects upon the conſtitution of government in the Catholic Church of Chriſt, and the conſtitution of government in the commonwealth of England, will find between them a very great and ſtriking analogy; and perhaps our Catholic anceſtors, ſmitten with the charms of ſo excellent a form, had framed their government in imitation of it,

after

after they had began to draw breath, and had rid themſelves of all dread from the frowns of arbitrary maſters. In the Catholic Church, there is the Pope, or ſupreme repreſentative and vicar of Jeſus Chriſt upon earth, as being the ſucceſſor of St. Peter in the See of Rome; and the particular Church of Rome, for this reaſon, is ſtiled the Mother and Miſtreſs of all other Churches, and the invariable center of their unity. The Heads of other particular Churches, are alſo all Princes of the Catholic Church, and Vicars and Repreſentatives of Jeſus Chriſt in the diſtricts of their reſpective governments; as are likewiſe all Prieſts; for they all repreſent Jeſus Chriſt in the diſcharge of the functions of their miniſtry: but for the purpoſes of good government, the Prieſts are ſubordinate to the Biſhops, the Biſhops to the Archbiſhops, and all together to the ſupreme Repreſentative of Jeſus Chriſt, the Biſhop of Rome. The Pope can decide nothing himſelf in the affairs of the Catholic Church without the advice of a privy council, or the advice of the whole Church, aſſembled in a general council. His privy council, conſiſting of a ſet number of Biſhops, Cardinals, and other Eccleſiaſtics at Rome, lies under conſiderable reſtrictions in

its

its deliberations, and cannot extend to any caſes of moment; but the Pope, by and with the advice of a general council of the whole Church, and by the authority of the ſame, is infallible in his deciſions. All thoſe that are acquainted with the Engliſh conſtitution, may trace the analogy between it and that of the Catholic Church; but with this difference, that the conſtitution of the one is temporal, ſubject to change, and is fallible in its deciſions; whereas the conſtitution of the other is ſpiritual, unchangeable, and infallible in its deciſions. But as the pre-eminence of the Pope is a point much conteſted by Proteſtants, I ſhall endeavour to throw greater light on it, and particularly in the view that all Catholics conſider it.

There are ſeveral reaſons that oblige all Catholics, and even the greateſt Catholic Princes, to render an extraordinary honour to the Pope, and it may be ſaid, that duty in a very great degree obliges them to ſhew him all poſſible reſpect. He is, as St. Bernard expreſſes it, the High-Prieſt, the ſovereign Pontiff, the Prince of Biſhops, the Heir of the Apoſtles, and the Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt: he is like unto

Abel

Abel in his Primacy, to Noah in his Government, to Abraham in his Patriarchate, to Melchiſedech in his Order, to Aaron in his Dignity, to Samuel in the excellence of his judgments, and to St. Peter in the power he had received from the Son of God; and by the authority of this power, he is the Head of Chriſtians, the Paſtor of the People, the Father of Kings, and God's Vice-gerent on earth. All theſe conſiderations have induced the far greater part of Chriſtian Princes to treat the Pope with all imaginable reſpect, and more eſpecially for the love of God, the ſupreme Lord of all, and mighty Ruler of Princes; who governing their ſtates by his Providence, will the oftener favour them with his bleſſings, in proportion to the honour they pay to his chief Repreſentative on earth, and not only to him, but to all his other Repreſentatives, whoſe perſons are ſacred, from the indelible character of the Royal Prieſthood. But if this motive had not a ſufficiently powerful aſcendant over the minds of Princes, to influence their deference for the Pope, they are, in ſome meaſure, obliged to it by a very important political reaſon, which is, to maintain themſelves in peace. For it has been always

judged

judged neceſſary, though Princes now ſeem to decline all thoughts of ſo ſalutary an intention, that there ſhould be between them, not ſo much an impartial Chief, as an univerſal Father of the whole Family of Jeſus Chriſt, who might decide their differences, moderate, by his counſels, the violence of thoſe who have engaged in unjuſt enterprizes, and unite their power and arms for guarding the Faith from the attempts of its natural enemies.

Now, if the Pope was made contemptible by the little reſpect Princes might bear him, what opinion ſhould they have of his being able to effect thoſe purpoſes? And what authority could he pretend to for appeaſing their differences? They would force him to keep within the bounds of his ſpiritual power, without interfering in their temporal intereſts; and yet the fire of war would be kindled up amongſt them with ſuch heat, as to deſtroy themſelves and their ſtates in the flames; whereas each of them, receiving honourably his counſels, and honouring with reſpect his exhortations, his dignity is made venerable to all, and he finds it in his power to compoſe all differences, to render unto every one their due, to hold forth

the

the bleſſings of peace to the people, and to ſtop ſhort the current of the injuries done them.

God, by eſtabliſhing in the world two ſorts of powers for governing it, formed ſuch a barrier againſt the vanity of man, ſays the learned Hincmarus, writing to Carloman, and the biſhops of France, that, to maintain them in humility, he was willing that the functions of their authority ſhould be entirely diſtinct and ſeparate. The perſons poſſeſſed of theſe powers are ſubject to one another; Kings to Eccleſiaſtics, and Eccleſiaſtics to Kings, yet without their powers being reciprocally dependent: 'Tis true, that the ſpiritual power is ſuperior to the temporal, according to the order of dignity, but not to imply ſubjection and authority in any degree, that he who is veſted with it, may ſtrip ſovereigns of their temporal power, or even moderate it. We muſt neceſſarily make a diſtinction between the ſubjection of perſons and that of powers; for tho' Jeſus Chriſt had reſolved, that all perſons in the world ſhould be ſubject to his Miniſters, and all his Miniſters ſubject to the King, thus giving unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's, and unto God the things that are God's; yet

he

he was not willing that thoſe two powers ſhould be under any real ſubjection themſelves, having given them both an equal authority for diſcharging their functions, and ſo as that the one ſhould have no power to deſtroy the other.

According to this true ſtate of the matter, the Supreme Head of the Church cannot aſſume any other quality, in regard to temporal princes for accommodating their differences, than that of Mediator: he may have a power over their conſcience, but not over their ſtates and the authority they have received from God, for governing them. In vain would he wreſt the ſcepter out of their hands. All the propoſals he ſhould make them, can paſs only for counſels. It may redound to his glory, as already obſerved, to be the means of pacification, but he cannot pretend to do it by authority. Neither ſhould he be partial; or reſerve to himſelf the favouring of any particular intereſt, for ſo ſoon as he is found to act ſuch a part, he no longer deſerves credit, and whatever he propoſes may be deemed ſuſpicious.

It cannot be denied, but that in former times ſome popes had arrogated to themſelves

ſelves a power over princes, which was greatly to the prejudice of their authority, and the ſtates they governed. In the reign of Lewis XIII. of France, a book was written and publiſhed by a Jeſuit, named Sanctarellus, which treated of the power of the Pope over Kings, and was approved of by the General of his order, by the Pope's Vicar, and by the Maſter of the ſacred Palace. His doctrine was thought to be very ſtrange, teaching, that the popes have a power of direction, or of correction over princes: that they cannot only excommunicate, but alſo deprive them of their kingdoms and abſolve their ſubjects from their oath of allegiance, either for hereſy or apoſtaſy, or for ſome great public crime, or for the inſufficiency of their perſons, or for not having defended the Church; and his Holineſs afterwards could give their ſtates to whom he thought proper.

The politicians of theſe times attributed this book to the ambition of the Spaniards, who had recourſe to all ſorts of artifice for fomenting diviſions in the ſtates of other princes, in order the more eaſily to obtain the effect of their deſigns; and their principle view then

was

was, to draw upon the King of France the hatred of all Chriſtendom, for the ſuccours he had given the Griſons, and the Hollanders, and for the aſſiſtance ſome German princes, oppreſſed by the Spaniards, expected from him. But as it is not much to our purpoſe to inquire who the promoters of this ſtrange opinion were, it may be ſufficient to obſerve, that it then made a great noiſe among the learned, and was attacked by ſeveral anſwers in print. The Pariſian faculty of divinity, in a full aſſembly, condemned it, though it was favoured by ſome remains of the old League; and not to leave the King's power unactive, on ſo important an occaſion, the parliament, which was then the depoſitory of it, cited the principal fathers of the Jeſuits to appear before them, and obliged them to ſign a declaration, whereby they condemned it, and to procure a like declaration to be ſubſcribed by all the provincials and rectors, and by ſix elders of each of their colleges in France; and the parliament afterwards ordered the book to be burnt by the hands of the common executioner, with a prohibition to all bookſellers to ſell any of the like quality.

It

It will not be amiss to animadvert hereupon, that it is often a matter of not less importance, to hinder royal authority from being prejudiced by the publication of a pernicious doctrine, than to oppose the violence attempted against it by force of arms. Our Queen Elizabeth, who was exceeding jealous of her authority, used sometimes very aptly to say, that it was like the apple of the eye, which could not bear to be in the least touched, without feeling extreme pain; for indeed, one cannot express how many misfortunes a state is exposed to, when this authority is ever so little invalidated. The magistracy, appointed in all states for preserving peace and administering justice, would undoubtedly, be guilty of extreme weakness in suffering any power to pretend a right to strip their sovereign of his authority. It would be making a wide open to the Great, or others bent upon raising tumults and seditions, to persuade the people that a king is subject to some scandalous sin, or incapable of governing, or suspected of heresy, or an abetor of heretics; and it might also serve as a pretext to the ambition of strangers, to invade a kingdom so stigmatized, and perhaps reduce it to slavery. All should be far from countenancing so dangerous

gerous an opinion; and accordingly we find it condemned as an error, by all the primitive fathers of the Catholic Church. None were bold enough to hazard ſuch a thought, and it found no encouragement till within a few centuries paſt, in the time of Gregory VII. who was the firſt Pope that availed himſelf of it.

A King cannot ceaſe to be a King, unleſs depoſed by thoſe who have conſtituted him ſuch, or unleſs his conduct manifeſts a default in the conditions whereby his conſtituents have declared he ſhonld forfeit his authority. The French argued againſt Sanctarellus, in ſupport of their Kings, that they were appointed by the hand of God, who had made uſe of their ſwords for placing the crown on their head; and God had not laid down apoſtacy, hereſy, or any other crime, as a condition to make void their authority, it being his will to make equally the good and bad to reign; conſequently, they could not be depoſed but by God himſelf, nor forfeit their authority by any crime. Beſides, if they could be depoſed by the Popes, it would follow, that the Popes are their ſuperiors in temporals, ſuch depoſition being an act of ſuperior juriſdiction. But the Popes

 are

are ſo far from being ſuperior to them in that point, that, on the contrary, the moſt renowned of antiquity have ingenuouſly declared, that they were inferior to them, and that their power was purely ſpiritual. There is ample teſtimony of this in a letter of Pope Gelaſius to the Emperor Anaſtaſius. Pelagius I. acknowledged the ſame, in a letter to Childebert, King of France; and St. Gregory to the Emperor Mauritius, and in ſuch expreſs terms, that their intention cannot be doubtful.

The French partizans of the divine right of their Kings, proceeded alſo to conſider the argument in another point of view, againſt ſome more moderate antagoniſts, in favour of Sanctarellus's opinion. Theſe alledged, that the power of depoſing Kings, attributed to the Pope, is not, in reality, direct, becauſe exerciſed not ſo much by diveſting them of the power of commanding, as by diſpenſing the ſubject from the obedience he had promiſed them. The anſwer was, that this ſubterfuge was very frivolous, becauſe the Popes cannot diſpenſe with a divine right, and becauſe the obedience due to Kings, is commanded by the divine authority in a hundred paſſages of the ſcripture,

ſcripture. They went farther, and ſaid, that it is not in the power of Kings to ſubject themſelves to the condition, of their ſubjects being diſcharged from their obedience upon any account whatſoever; becauſe they cannot prejudice the royal authority that was depoſited in their hands, and are obliged to make a return of it intire, and not mutilated, to their ſucceſſors. Whence, Philip the Long, willing to make a treaty with his ſubjects of Flanders, and to grant them, as ſecurity, that it ſhould be allowed them to take up arms againſt him, and withdraw themſelves from their obedience, if he prevaricated on his part: he was hindered by thoſe of his council, who remonſtrated to him, that his Majeſty could be allowed no ſuch condition.

I have dwelt thus long upon this point, to ſhew what the ſentiments of the Catholics really are concerning the power of the Pope; and no Proteſtant can properly take umbrage at them. The arguments inſiſted upon, have been, for the moſt part, borrowed from a French hiſtory of the miniſtry of Cardinal Richlieu, written in the laſt century; and their antiquity ſufficiently evinces, that the

Catholics have been long clear of the imputation of believing that there is any power in the Pope able to affect the temporal concerns of Princes: conſequently the crown of England, in ſhewing the Catholics any favour, can be under no apprehenſion of their having any other temporal intereſt to ſerve, but that of their country. As to an authority, entirely confined to ſpirituals, it is quite out of the queſtion, and can be no manner of impediment to their approving themſelves good ſubjects, unleſs it is thought that this ſpiritual authority can diſpenſe with their oath of allegiance, which, indeed, it cannot; for, when once taken, it is binding in conſcience, and no power on earth, ſpiritual or temporal, can diſſolve an obligation ſo ſolemnly ratified, and even ratified in heaven.

I ſhall now make a ſummary of the Catholic Profeſſion of Faith, that the Proteſtants may ſee how far they have miſrepreſented it. A ſimple expoſition of the kind is always allowable, and can give no offence; becauſe when people miſtake your principles, either wilfully or ignorantly, ſome very abſurd and prepoſterous concluſions may be drawn from them.

The

The Catholics believe the Scriptures, according to the Canon received by them, to be divinely inſpired, and therefore the will and word of God, revealed and ſpoken unto man in order to his ſalvation. What is called the Apocrypha, they read and uſe for the inſtruction of life, but not to build faith thereon for the proof of any doctrine. The Scriptures are their Rule of Faith, not as interpreted by private judgments, but by the Church, whoſe authority, in this reſpect, they revere as indiſputable, for the reaſons produced in chap. III. Beſides the written word of God, they hold an unwritten word, which they call Tradition. "This * was the firſt rule of "Chriſtianity; and when the writings of the "New Teſtament were added, this unwritten "word did not, upon that account, loſe its "authority; which makes Catholicks receive, "with equal veneration, all that was ever "taught by the Apoſtles, whether by writing "or by word of mouth, as St. Paul himſelf "has expreſly declared," *Therefore, brethren,*



* See Biſhop of Meaux's Expoſition of the Catholic Faith. Sect. XVIII.

*ſtand faſt, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epiſtle.* 2 Theſſ. ii. 15. They believe the Apoſtles, the Nicene and Athanaſian creeds, as all three conformable to the word of God: the firſt they uſe in their common prayers, the ſecond in their Liturgy, and the third occaſionally in the office of the Church. They hold ſeven ſacraments, Baptiſm, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. Theſe are all means for ſanctification, when worthily received, though not neceſſary to all, nor all immediately neceſſary to ſalvation. Two of them were inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, viz. Baptiſm and the Euchariſt; and the reſt by the Apoſtles, according to Chriſt's particular inſtructions; for they all have the warrant of the written word of God, have the matter and form required for ſacraments, and are ſenſible ſigns of the inviſible grace, conveyed to the humble and well diſpoſed ſoul. The Church of England has ſet aſide Extreme Unction in practice, though it does not deny its uſe in the primitive Church, nor diſpute the Epiſtle of St. James that authenticates it, to be canonical Scripture. The other four it has adopted, though not under

the

the denomination of Sacraments. I cannot ſee, however, what ſhould hinder their retaining that name; for in the Church of England Catechiſm, the queſtion being aſked, "How "many ſacraments hath Chriſt ordained in his "Church?" the anſwer ſays, "Two only, "as generally neceſſary to ſalvation;" whereby it ſeems to be implied, that there are more, or may be more, but not ſo neceſſary to ſalvation as Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, which Chriſt himſelf had inſtituted. I muſt confeſs, notwithſtanding, that the words *generally neceſſary*, admit of great ambiguity in diſcourſe, a ſignal fault in a Definition, the terms of which ſhould be ſo clear, as to leave no room for equivocation. If the import of *generally* be *abſolutely*, the ſenſe of the whole will be ſo affirmative, as to admit of no reſtriction in its univerſality, otherwiſe *generally* will ſignify no more, than that Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper are not quite ſo neceſſary to ſalvation, but that they may be omitted: for a thing is only neceſſary two ways, either ſimply for ſerving a purpoſe, or abſolutely for ſerving the ſame purpoſe. A horſe or vehicle is ſimply neceſſary for the purpoſe of performing a journey, but not abſolutely, becauſe that journey may be

performed a-foot. Now, as the word *generally* cannot denote an univerſal affimative, it muſt be reſolved into, *ſimply, or a thing of mere convenience*, and *wanted, in no degree, of abſolute neceſſity*; which conſtruction opens a wide door to diffidence and ſcepticiſm in the two capital articles of a Chriſtian's ſanctification.

But leaving this doubt to be cleared up by the divines of the Church of England, I muſt throw together ſome reflections on the Euchariſt, a ſacrament, which moſt of the Reformers have not dared to expunge, though ſome have; but they have embarraſſed it in ſuch a labyrinth of intricacies; and ſo confounded the intent and meaning of it in a multiplicity of opinion and diſceptation, that very few of them believe alike, or indeed know what to believe concerning it.

There is no part of Chriſt's doctrine he took more particular pains to inculcate than this. The Goſpel of St. John, chap. vi. records, how he had prepared his beloved Apoſtles and Diſciples for it long before its inſtitution. St. Paul, who was afterwards called to be an Apoſtle, *not of men, neither by man, but by Jeſus Chriſt*

*Chriſt, and God the Father.* Gal. i. 1. tells the Corinthians how he had *received of the Lord*, by a particular revelation, his inſtitution of this ſacrament, *which he alſo had delivered unto them.* 1. Cor. xi. 23. St. Luke emphatically expreſſes the longing Chriſt had to impart this pledge of his infinite love and bleſſing to mankind: *With deſire I have deſired to eat this paſſover with you before I ſuffer.* Luke xxii. 15. If we reflect a moment, we cannot help being perſuaded but that there was ſomething very extraordinary in this behaviour of Chriſt, and that he muſt have ſome great and glorious deſign in view by the inſtitution of this ſacrament. Let us read attentively over, and with a mind prepared, by the humility of the heart, for receiving inſtruction, the ſixth chapter of St. John's Goſpel, and we ſhall diſcover this deſign of Chriſt. He was willing, by an intimate and myſtic union, to be always with his church, that he might preſent her to God, his father, acceptable and lovely, holy and beautiful, pure and undefiled, without ſpot or wrinkle: So alſo, he was willing to be intimately and myſtically united with every one of the members of his Church who ſhould ſeek this union in newneſs of life, and beauty of

holineſs; and the means, as a ſeal fixed upon ſuch newneſs of life, and beauty of holineſs, and as a pledge of his union, was to be the participation of his body and blood. *Who ſo eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day. For my fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father: ſo, he that eateth me, even he ſhall live by me.* John vi. 54, 55, 56, 57. Let us not now ſtrive amongſt ourſelves, as the Jews and Capernaites of old did, ſaying, *how can this man give us his fleſh to eat?* Ib. 52. *This is an hard ſaying, who can hear it?* Ib. 60. Rather let us ſay with St. Peter; *Lord to whom ſhall we go? Thou haſt the words of eternal life.* Ib. 68. The Capernaites underſtood the eating of Chriſt's body to be in a carnal and groſs manner; but Chriſt himſelf undeceived them; *It is the ſpirit that quickeneth, the fleſh profiteth nothing: The words that I ſpeak unto you, they are ſpirit and they are life.* Ib. 63. Chriſt is then himſelf the ſpiritual food of the ſoul, and by this ſpiritual food he becomes its ſpiritual life, being really and ſubſtantially, body and blood, ſoul and

and divinity, preſent to and united with, the members of his myſtical body, the Church, and that in a very intimate manner, by means of this ſacrament.

Such is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, deduced from the expreſs words of the ſcripture, in regard to the Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt; and it has been always invariably believed and maintained in the Church, from the begining to this day; and ſo we find it in all the ancient Liturgies, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Moſarabic, Greek, and Latin. The Proteſtants cannot make any rational objection to the contrary, and it is in vain for them to ſay, St. Chryſoſtome, in particular, did not believe Tranſubſtantiation, as appears from his Epiſtle to the Monk Cæſarius. St. Chryſoſtome believed all that was neceſſary to be believed concerning the Real Preſence, and we find this belief ſet forth in his own Liturgy. The term *Tranſubſtantiation* was not then known, but what is now meant by that term was then very well known. It was afterwards uſed againſt Berengarius, and again more freely adopted in contradiſtinction to the *Conſubſtantiation*, or *Impanation* that was firſt aſſerted by Wick-

Wickliffe, and not by Luther, who only copied Wickliffe's opinion. The Church, no doubt, can at all times make uſe of an explanatory term; and ſo ſhe before did, in condemning the Arian Hereſy, of the terms, ὁμοούσιος, οὐσία, ὑπόστασις, to which the Arians oppoſed their term of ὁμοιούσιος. The Proteſtant, in diſputing againſt Tranſubſtantiation, cannot diſpute the power of God, in changing one ſubſtance into another. Let him read over the miracles wrought by Moſes in Egypt; let him examine the New Teſtament, where, among other things, he will find water changed into wine. But he here finds a conſtant relation of his ſenſes. 'Tis true; and if he was to find the ſame in the change of the elements of bread and wine in the Euchariſt, it would be no longer a myſtery of faith, no longer an object of faith. Deſcartes, when he placed the eſſence of matter in actual extenſion, and was aſked by Father Merſenne, how he could juſtify his opinion, as the body of Chriſt was in the Euchariſt without actual extenſion, he ſaid that God could make poſſible ſupernaturally, what was impoſſible in a natural way; and hence we ſee that as the body of Chriſt cannot be actually extended in the Euchariſt,

it

it muſt be there in a ſpiritual and ſupernatural way, excluding every other ſubſtance.

There is an Act of the Parliament of England, 30 Car. II. ſtat. 2. cap. 1. treating the ſacrifice of the Maſs as idolatrous, becauſe the Catholics adore there Jeſus Chriſt, as preſent, after the words of conſecration are pronounced. If they were to adore there, or in the Euchariſt, mere bread and wine, the charge of idolatry, by this Act of Parliament, would ſtand good againſt them; but their adoration is directed to Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, whom they believe to be there preſent, in conſequence of the words of conſecration being pronounced; and all intelligent Proteſtants, who have acted candidly, have conſtantly allowed, that thoſe who are perſuaded of the Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, ſhould pay to him in it their adorations. Now how many Proteſtants are convinced of the truth of the Real Preſence, I don't ſay Lutherans, but of the Church of England, and this Church's Catechiſm is ſtrong in its favour, though the end of the definition is tinctured with Calviniſm: *The Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken*

*and*

Wickliffe, and not by Luther, who only copied Wickliffe's opinion. The Church, no doubt, can at all times make uſe of an explanatory term; and ſo ſhe before did, in condemning the Arian Hereſy, of the terms, ὁμούσιος, οὐσία, ὑπόστασις, to which the Arians oppoſed their term of ὁμοιούσιος. The Proteſtant, in diſputing againſt Tranſubſtantiation, cannot diſpute the power of God, in changing one ſubſtance into another. Let him read over the miracles wrought by Moſes in Egypt; let him examine the New Teſtament, where, among other things, he will find water changed into wine. But he here finds a conſtant relation of his ſenſes. 'Tis true; and if he was to find the ſame in the change of the elements of bread and wine in the Euchariſt, it would be no longer a myſtery of faith, no longer an object of faith. Deſcartes, when he placed the eſſence of matter in actual extenſion, and was aſked by Father Merſenne, how he could juſtify his opinion, as the body of Chriſt was in the Euchariſt without actual extenſion, he ſaid that God could make poſſible ſupernaturally, what was impoſſible in a natural way; and hence we ſee that as the body of Chriſt cannot be actually extended in the Euchariſt,

it

it muſt be there in a ſpiritual and ſupernatural way, excluding every other ſubſtance.

There is an Act of the Parliament of England, 30 Car. II. ſtat. 2. cap. 1. treating the ſacrifice of the Maſs as idolatrous, becauſe the Catholics adore there Jeſus Chriſt, as preſent, after the words of conſecration are pronounced. If they were to adore there, or in the Euchariſt, mere bread and wine, the charge of idolatry, by this Act of Parliament, would ſtand good againſt them; but their adoration is directed to Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, whom they believe to be there preſent, in conſequence of the words of conſecration being pronounced; and all intelligent Proteſtants, who have acted candidly, have conſtantly allowed, that thoſe who are perſuaded of the Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, ſhould pay to him in it their adorations. Now how many Proteſtants are convinced of the truth of the Real Preſence, I don't ſay Lutherans, but of the Church of England, and this Church's Catechiſm is ſtrong in its favour, though the end of the definition is tinctured with Calviniſm: *The Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken*

*and*

*and received*, but not merely becauſe you *believe* it to be ſo; and if you did *not believe* it, there would be no Body and Blood *verily and indeed:* but *your faith* does nothing in the matter; *the Body and Blood are there verily and indeed*, independently of *your faith:* the * good and the bad, the worthy and the unworthy, equally receive them, but the one to his ſalvation, and the other to his damnation, *being guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and *not diſcerning the Lord's Body*. 1 Cor. xi. 27. 29. I could cite alſo many eminent Divines of the Church of England, who believed that the ſacrifice of the Maſs is a commemorative ſacrifice, though they ſeem loath to acknowledge it to be likewiſe propitiatory for the living and the dead, as the Catholics hold it to be. One muſt think, that the conſtant application of the merits of Chriſt's ſacrifice on the croſs is highly propitiatory; but let us hear the Biſhop of Meaux on this head, who cannot fail giving an intire ſatisfaction: †

"In

* Sumunt boni, ſumunt mali, ſorte tamen inequali, vitæ vel interitus. Mors eſt malis, vita bonis; vide pans ſumptionis, quam ſit diſpar exitus. Rythm. S. T. Aquin.

† Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. Sect. XIV.

" In the conſecration, the Body and Blood
" are myſtically ſeparated, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt
" ſaid ſeparately, *This is my Body*, *This is my*
" *Blood*; which includes a lively and effica-
" cious repreſentation of the violent death he
" ſuffered.

" So that the Son of God is placed upon
" the holy table, in virtue of theſe words
" cloathed with thoſe ſigns which repreſent
" his death: this is effected by conſecration;
" and this action of Religion carries with it
" an acknowledgement of God's ſovereignty;
" inaſmuch as Jeſus Chriſt, there preſent, re-
" news and perpetuates, in ſome ſort, the re-
" membrance of his being obedient, even to
" the death of the croſs: ſo that there is no-
" thing wanting to render this a true ſacrifice.

" We cannot doubt but this action, as di-
" ſtinct from that of communicating, is of
" itſelf acceptable to God, and makes him
" look upon us with a more propitious eye,
" becauſe it repreſents to him that voluntary
" death which his beloved Son has ſuffered for
" us ſinners; or rather places before his eyes
" that very Son of his, under the ſigns of this
" death,

" death, by which his wrath had been ap-
" peaſed.

" All Chriſtians will confeſs the ſole pre-
" ſence of Jeſus Chriſt to be a moſt powerful
" interceſſion before God for all mankind, ac-
" cording to the ſaying of the Apoſtle, *That*
" *Jeſus Chriſt preſents himſelf, and appears for*
" *us before the face of God.* Heb. xi. 24. So
" that we believe Jeſus Chriſt, being preſent
" upon the holy table, under this figure of
" death, intercedes for us, and repreſents con-
" tinually to his father that death which he
" has ſuffered for his Church.

" It is in this ſenſe we ſay Jeſus Chriſt of-
" fers up himſelf to God for us in the Eucha-
" riſt; it is after this manner we conceive this
" oblation renders God more propitious to us,
" and therefore we call this a propitiatory ſa-
" crifice.

" When we conſider what it is Jeſus Chriſt
" operates in this myſtery, and when we ſee
" him, by faith, preſent upon this holy table,
" together with theſe ſigns of death, we unite
" ourſelves to him in this eſtate; we preſent

" him

" him to God as our only victim, and our ſole
" propitiator by his Blood; confeſſing we have
" nothing to offer up to God but Jeſus Chriſt,
" and the infinite merit of his death. We
" conſecrate all our prayers by this holy obla-
" tion, and in preſenting Jeſus Chriſt to God,
" we learn, at the ſame time, to offer up our-
" ſelves to the divine Majeſty, in him and
" by him, as living ſacrifices.

" This is the ſacrifice of Chriſtians, infi-
" nitely different from what was offered up in
" the Old Law: a ſpiritual ſacrifice becoming
" the New Covenant, in which the preſence
" of the victim is only perceived by faith; in
" which the word of God is the ſpiritual ſword
" which makes a myſtical ſeperation betwixt
" the Body and Blood; in which by conſe-
" quence the blood is only ſhed myſtically,
" and in which death only intervenes by re-
" preſentation; and yet, however, a real ſa-
" crifice, in as much as Jeſus Chriſt is there
" truly contained and preſented to his father,
" under this figure of death: but a comme-
" morative ſacrifice, which is ſo far from
" taking away our adheſion to the ſacrifice of
" the croſs, as it is objected to us, that, on

" the

" the contrary, it fixes us the firmer to it,
" by all its circumſtances; ſeeing it has not
" only an intire relation to it, but, in reality,
" has neither being nor ſubſtance but by this
" relation, from whence it derives all the vir-
" tue contained in it.

" This is the expreſs doctrine of the Catho-
" lic Church in the Council of Trent, which
" teaches that this ſacrifice is inſtituted only
" *to repreſent that which was once accompliſhed*
" *upon the croſs*; *to perpetuate the memory of it*
" *to the end of the world*; *and to apply to us the*
" *ſaving virtue of it for the remiſſion of thoſe ſins*
" *which we commit every day*. (Seſſ. 22. cap. 1.)
" So that the Church is ſo far from believing
" that ſomething is wanting to perfect the ſa-
" crifice of the croſs, that, on the contrary,
" ſhe thinks it ſo perfect, and ſo fully ſuffi-
" cient, as what is added is only inſtituted to
" celebrate the memory and apply its virtue.

" By which the ſame Church acknowledges,
" that all the merit of the Redemption of
" mankind depends upon the death of the Son
" of God; and it ought to be underſtood,
" that when we ſay to God in the celebration

" of

" of the divine myſtery, *We offer thee this holy*
" *Hoſt*, we pretend not, by this oblation, to
" make or preſent to God a new payment of
" the price of our ſalvation, but to offer up to
" him, in our behalf, the merits of our bleſſed
" Jesus there preſent, and the infinite price
" which he once paid for us upon the croſs."

I aſk pardon of the reader for obtruding upon him this long quotation; but as I am no Divine myſelf, nor have any pretentions that way, I preſumed that the Sacrifice of the Maſs, the higheſt and the moſt ſolemn act of the Catholic religion, could not be better illuſtrated than by the pen of ſo eminent a prelate as M. Boſſuet, Biſhop of Meaux. And indeed, whoever will give himſelf the trouble of reading his Expoſition, will ſee the true ſtate of the Catholic Faith, and need not require any other book to give him a proper and adequate idea of it.

I have only a few other things to add, in which Catholics ſeem to be miſrepreſented here in England. Dr. Lowth, whoſe bright genius, great learning, and abilities as a divine, have raiſed him to the See of Oxford,

is

is pleaſed to ſay, with regard to the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, in a Life of William of Wikeham, not long ſince publiſhed by him, " That this * perſuaſion [praying for the " Dead] owed its origin to certain cuſtoms, " that prevailed in the early ages of the Church, " innocent perhaps, and blameleſs in them- " ſelves, but miſtaken at length, and per- " verted from their firſt intention to much " ſuperſtition, both in opinion and practice: " that prayers for the dead ſeemed at firſt to " have been uſed only at their funerals; that " for the greater ſolemnity, they often choſe " to join the ſervice of the interment of the " dead to the celebration of the Euchariſt; " ———that the people began to conclude, " that ſuch ſervices were not merely intended " for a memorial of the deceaſed, and for their " own edification; but were, in ſome way, " profitable to thoſe, in whoſe behalf they " ſeemed to be made; that theſe oblations and " ſacrifices, though called commemorative, " were eaſily miſtaken for propitiatory; and " the dead were ſuppoſed to obtain pardon for " their

* Pages 278, 279, 280.

" their ſins thro' the interceſſion of the living;
" and that, at laſt, to account fully for a prac-
" tice either ill-founded or miſunderſtood, the
" doctrine of Purgatory was invented, or ra-
" ther borrowed from the heathen: for, con-
" cludes he, it happens in theology, as well
" as in natural philoſophy, that to give ſup-
" port and conſtancy to our own vain ima-
" ginations, with regard to ſome obſcure and
" miſtaken queſtion, we are apt to have re-
" courſe to ſome new hypotheſis equally ima-
" ginary and vain."

Now Dr. Lowth muſt be very diſingenuous, or he muſt confeſs himſelf, though a divine, quite ignorant of the Catholic doctrine on which prayers for the dead, and purgatory are grounded. This doctrine is *the temporal puniſhment due to ſin.* If he can prove, that no ſuch thing as a temporal puniſhment due to ſin exiſts, I will give him up purgatory and prayers for the dead; but I think I can produce numerous inſtances from ſcripture of the juſtice of God requiring ſuch puniſhment; ſo that I muſt conſider what he has ſaid here as idle, imaginary, and bordering on romance. Though no direct and poſitive proof may be found

found in the written word of God in ſupport of Purgatory, yet the univerſal conſent of all Chriſtians, for many centuries, is a ſtrong proof that it is an apoſtolical doctrine. God entirely remits ſin by Baptiſm, without reſerving any puniſhment. By the infinite merit of Chriſt's ſufferings, the eternal puniſhment due to ſin is forgiven, but ſtill there may remain a ſatisfaction, on the part of the ſinner, due to God's juſtice; and this ſatisfaction, muſt be in this world, or in the world to come. Let us not deceive ourſelves; nothing under the ſtain of any polution can immediately enter heaven, or be admitted to immediate happineſs. The ſcripture mentions, that there are ſome ſins which ſhall neither be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come; therefore there is a forgivneſs of ſome ſins in the other world, or ſatisfaction to be made by the ſinner; and reaſon tells us, that ſome temporal pain ſhould be exacted of us to retain us in our duty; and Catholics are as ſenſible as Proteſtants, that their Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt has fully ſatisfied for them, and they hereby do not in the leaſt pretend to extenuate any thing of the infinite value of his merits.

But

But I ſhall beg leave once more to quote the Biſhop of Meaux. " Thoſe, † ſays he, who " depart this life in grace and charity, but " nevertheleſs indebted to the divine juſtice for " ſome pains which it reſeved, are to ſuffer " them in the other life. This is what obliged " all the primitive Chriſtians to offer up pray- " ers, alms-deeds, and ſacrifices, for the faith- " ful who departed in peace, and in the com- " munion of the Church, with an aſſured " faith that they could be aſſiſted by theſe " means. This is what the Council of Trent " propoſes to our belief, touching the ſouls " detained in purgatory, without determining " in what their pains conſiſt, or many other " ſuch like things; concerning which this " holy council demands great moderation, " blaming thoſe who devulge what is uncer- " tain or ſuſpected.

" The very conſideration of what we call " *ſatisfaction*, being nothing but the applica- " tion of the infinite *ſatisfaction* of JESUS " CHRIST, ought to appeaſe thoſe who are " offended

† Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. Sect. VIII.

" offended when we tell them, that God is ſo
" well pleaſed with fraternal charity, and the
" communion of ſaints, that he frequently al-
" ſo accepts of thoſe ſatisfactions which we
" offer up one for another. Certainly thoſe
" who have read and conſidered how God him-
" ſelf inſpires his ſervants with a deſire to af-
" flict themſelves with faſting, hair-cloth and
" aſhes, not only for their own ſins, but alſo
" for the ſins of all the people, will not be
" aſtoniſhed if we ſay, that being touched
" with the delight he has to gratify his friends,
" he mercifully accepts of the humble ſacrifice
" of their voluntary mortifications, in abate-
" ment of thoſe chaſtiſements he prepared for
" his people; which ſhews, that being ſatiſ-
" fied by theſe he renders himſelf more mild
" towards the others; by this means honour-
" ing his ſon JESUS CHRIST in the commu-
" nion of his members, and in the holy ſociety
" of his myſtical body."

The doctrine of *Indulgence* is connected with that of purgatory. *Indulgence* is not a leave to commit ſin, nor yet a pardon for ſin, but only a relaxing of ſome part of the temporal puniſhment due to ſin. The neceſſity of ſatisfactory

ſatisfactory works, as we have ſeen above, cauſed the primitive Church to impoſe upon ſinners thoſe pains, called canonical; which, when they performed with humility, the Church having a regard to their fervour and ſincerity, mitigated ſome part of them. No Proteſtant, of the Church of England, can deny the power of *binding and looſing* in the Church, and the Council of Trent propoſes nothing elſe to be believed concerning Indulgences, but that *the power to grant them has been given to the Church by Jeſus Chriſt, and that the uſe of them is beneficial to ſalvation*; to which this council adds, *that this power ought to be retained, yet uſed with moderation, leſt eccleſiaſtical diſcipline ſhould be weakened by an over-great facility.* Whence it appears, that the Church is not ſo tenacious of retaining the uſe of Indulgences, but that ſhe may at any time ſet them aſide.

The ſame Act of the Parliament of England, above referred to, that treats the Sacrifice of the Maſs as ſuperſtitious and idolatrous, paſſes the like cenſure on the *invocation*, or *adoration* of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint. The Catholics, in conſequence of an Article,

of their Creed, called *the Communion of Saints*, invoke, 'tis true, the ſaints and friends of God, that reign with him in his glory, to intercede and pray for them; but it is a vile calumny to ſay, that they therefore *adore*, or *worſhip* the ſaints. They only beg their prayers, as we do in this life the prayers of one another; and if I deſire *John* to pray for me, this does not argue that I pray to *John*, or render him by ſuch deſire any worſhip. The prayer of the Juſt is, no doubt, acceptable to God, and God will have regard to it. The Catholics all know that the Saints are very happy in heaven, and that their happineſs is the effect of the mercies of God, who, in rewarding their merits, has crowned only his own gifts in them; none can therefore preſume that they require any worſhip, or would have any thing derogated from the honour due to God alone, by praiſe, thankſgiving, and adoration. But, ſays the Proteſtant, there is no occaſion to invoke the ſaints for their prayers or interceſſion, as they do not hear you. How does the Proteſtant know but that the ſaints enjoy the ſight of the beatific viſion? It is very probable they do; and if ſo, they hear our prayers. The Church, hower, has decided

cided nothing in the matter, leaving it to conjecture, whether the ſaints have a knowledge of our neceſſities by the communication of angels, who, according to ſcripture, know, as God's adminiſtering ſpirits, what paſſes in this world, or whether God himſelf makes them acquainted with our deſires by a particular revelation; or whether laſtly, he diſcovers theſe deſires to them in his divine eſſence, in which all truth is comprehended.

There is nothing more material in any other point of faith or doctrine, that deſerves being diſcuſſed; for, as to points of mere diſcipline, they may be conſidered as in a fluctuating condition; new regulations may ariſe, and the old ones may be aboliſhed, as the Church thinks fit, without any detriment to her faith. So that, from all that has been ſaid in this chapter, I conclude with a thought of the Chevalier Ramſay, "it was thus, ſays he, that the "Archbiſhop [Fenelon of Cambrai] convin-"ced me, that a ſober thinking Deiſt, muſt "of neceſſity become a Chriſtian, and that "a Chriſtian cannot reaſon philoſophically "without becoming a Catholic."

Now

Now, gentlemen Proteſtants, what is your opinion of the Catholics? Can their principles of faith or morality be prejudicial to the welfare of any ſtate? Still if their religion offends you, and you have an unconquerable averſion againſt it, throw a veil over it, and keep it hidden from your eyes. But do not reject them as countrymen, fellow-citizens, and brethren. Civil Society calls upon you to do them, as ſuch, all the good offices in your power; the common right of ſubjects intitles them to your benevolence, and humanity dictates that you ſhould no longer think of oppreſſing them. They offer their ſincere allegiance to his Majeſty King GEORGE, and his PARLIAMENT, and they have reaſon to flatter themſelves from the conſtant endeavours of the paternal care and tenderneſs of his Majeſty to promote the happineſs of his people, that they, among the reſt, will be again adopted into the condition of his dutiful children. In ſuch diſpoſitions, and with the warmeſt wiſhes for the proſperity of his Majeſty and his Government, they hope their humble petition will not be rejected.

*FINIS.*

BRITISH
19 FE 91
MUSEUM